DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 375 UD 014 544

AUTHOR	Fox, Andrew; And Others
TITLE	In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps. 14/15 Year-Old Black Teenage Girl Project, Memphis, Tennessee. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Memphis City School System, Tenn.; Social Service Delivery Systems, Memphis, Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
REPORT NO	DLMA-42-47-73-01-05
PUB DATE	31 Dec 73
NOTE	175p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151 (Price not quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$7.80 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Adolescents; Attendance Records; *Females; Juvenile Courts; *Negro Students; Peer Groups; Personality Assessment; *Program Evaluation; Research Methodology; Role Models; Urban Education; *Work Experience Programs; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Tennessee

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the effects on 14- and 15-year-old black teenage girls of entering and participating in a specially designed work program. The girls were provided with supports in their work settings, well-defined tasks, supervisors as well as regularly scheduled peer interaction groups led by a young black woman considered to be an appropriate role model. The entire process of recruitment, selection, and certification was conducted by the Memphis In-school Neighborhood Youth Corps office. Two kinds of data were collected: (1) personality assessment on the experimental group and on the two control groups, and (2) external source data, consisting of school grades, school absences and tardiness, juvenile court contacts, known pregnancies, and on-job performance evaluations. The selected experimental group were given work assignments as assistants to teachers and leaders in afterschool day care centers in poverty neighborhoods. They were directed by job supervisors in each center, and participated in regular discussion-interaction groups. In brief, the youth employment program, supported by peer interaction groups, produced positive outcomes for those included in it. At the same time, those who were not included in the program (or who dropped out) showed negative changes in school grades and self-concepts, as well as an increased perception of themselves as being at the mercy of chance or luck rather than controlling their own destinies. (Author/JM)

ED 096375

In-school Neighborhood Youth Corps

14/15 Year-old Black Teenage Girl Project, Memphis, Tn.

FINAL REPORT
December 31, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Andrew Fox, A.C.S.W.
W. Theodore May, Ph.D.
Paul L. Schwartz, A.C.S.W.

UD 014 544

This report of a demonstration project was prepared under a grant from the Manpower Administration, U. S. Department of Labor, under the authority of Economic Opportunity Act. The report was prepared by Social Service Delivery Systems, subcontractor to grantee Memphis Board of Education, under Research and Demonstration Grant No. MPRD 42-47-73-01. Organizations undertaking such projects under the government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. DLMA 42-47-73-01-05	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle: In-school Neighborhood Youth Corps 14/15 Year-old Black Teenage Girl Project, Memphis, Tennessee			5. Report Date: February 3, 1974 6.
7. Author(s)			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address: Memphis Board of Education, 2597 Avery St., Memphis, Tn.			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract/Grant No. DL MPRD 42-47-73-01
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Office of Research and Development, 1111 20th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20210			13. Type of Report & Period Covered: Final 14.

15. Supplementary Notes: Social Service Delivery Systems served as research subcontractor to the Memphis Board of Education. SSDS assumes full responsibility for the accuracy of the data included herein.

16. Abstracts: This study analyzes the effects on 14/15 year-old black girls of entering and participating in a specially designed work program. The girls were provided with supports in their work settings, including well-defined tasks, supervisors, and regularly scheduled peer interaction groups led by young black women considered to be appropriate role models. Personality assessment data and external source data on behavior were collected and analyzed, on an experimental group and two control groups. The special supports designed for the experimental group resulted in differential results when compared with the control groups. The experimental group maintained their levels of functioning, whereas a control group of the same age did not show comparable maintenance of functioning. Leavers from the experimental group showed particularly negative outcomes.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

manpower
females
black
adolescent
peer-support groups
role model

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

In-school Neighborhood Youth Corps
future job choice-making process
psychological variables
work supervisor ratings
demographic variables

17c. COSATI Field/Group

18. Availability Statement: Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151.

19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED

20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED

21. No. of Pages 163

22. Price

FORM NTIS-35 (REV. 3-72)

THIS FORM MAY BE REPRODUCED

USCOMM-DC 14952-P72

"A female child is most likely to develop achievement behavior and independence when her parents are moderately warm, moderate to highly permissive, and when they reinforce and encourage achievement efforts."

- "The Socialization of Achievement Orientation in Females," Aletha H. Stein and Margaret M. Bailey, Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 80, No. 5, 1973

Table of Contents

	Page
I. Abstract	4
II. Summary and Recommendations	7
A. Findings	7
B. Recommendations	10
III. Selective Review of Relevant In-school NYC Research	13
IV. Statement of the Hypothesis	17
V. Field Study Research Design	19
A. Introduction	19
B. Data Base	22
C. Work Sites	23
D. Training and Orientation	24
E. Description of Program	26
F. Other Data	28
G. Peer Interaction Groups	30
H. Group Leaders/Role Models	38
VI. Data from External Sources	42
A. School Grades	42
B. School Absence	45
C. School Tardiness	46
D. Juvenile Court Data	48
E. Reported Pregnancy	49
F. Work Supervisor Ratings	50
VII. Test Data from Study Population	52
A. Description of the tests	53
B. Findings of the Tests	60
VIII. Comments and Discussion by the Research Team	91
IX. References	99
X. Appendices	101

Table of Tables

Table Number	Table	Page
1	Analysis of Leavers	29
2	1971-72 School Year Grades	42
3	1972-73 School Year Grades	43
4	Grade Point Averages, Remainers and Leavers	44
5	School Absences, 1971-72 and 1972-73	45
6	School Tardiness, 1971-1972 and 1972-73	47
7	Work Supervisors Rating Scale, two groups	50
8	Work Supervisors Rating Scale, Remainers and Leavers	51
	Test Instruments and Administration Dates	52
9	Number of Test Participants	53
10	Sten Scores, High School Personality Questionnaire Form A	60
11	Sten Scores, 14 Variables High School Personality Questionnaire	62
12	Sten Scores, High School Personality Questionnaire Two Younger Groups	64
13	Ezekiel Fictional Autobiography, Initial Testing	67
14	Bialer Locus of Control, Three Testings	70

Table Number	Table	Page
15	Bialer Locus of Control, Remainers and Leavers	71
16	Srole Anomie Scale, Three Testings	72
17	Srole Anomie Scale, Remainers and Leavers	73
18	McClosky and Schaar Anomie Scale, Three Testings	74
19	McClosky and Schaar Anomie Scale, Remainers and Leavers	74
20	Middleton Anomie Scale, Three Testings	75
21	Middleton Anomie Scale, Remainers and Leavers	76
22	Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control, Two Testings	76
23	Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control, Remainers and Leavers	78
24	Piers-Harris Self Concept, Three Testings	79
25	Piers-Harris Self Concept, Remainers and Leavers	81

I. Abstract

This study analyzes the effects on 14/15 year-old black teenage girls of entering and participating in a specially designed work program. The girls were provided with supports in their work settings, well-defined tasks, supervisors, as well as regularly scheduled peer interaction groups led by a young black woman considered to be an appropriate role model.

The Manpower Administration has long been concerned with the effects of work programs for adolescents. It has funded a variety of research and demonstration efforts designed to explore such outcomes as remaining in school, entering the labor market, becoming effective in the job search, and preventing future difficulty. The literature on these efforts is reviewed in Section III. A major theme has consistently emerged from this literature - the need for counseling and peer group supports to strengthen the commitment of the adolescent to effectiveness in appropriate school and work experiences.

In the context of these studies and recommendations, this current study was developed with the hypothesis that positive outcomes would result if 14 and 15 year-old black teenage girls were involved in a work program two years earlier than is usual for NYC, and were supported by peer interaction groups led by effective black female role models.

In order to minimize distortion of the experimental design, the entire process of recruitment, selection, and certification was conducted by the Memphis In-school Neighborhood Youth Corps office. The Memphis In-school NYC follows federal guidelines in the recruitment, selection, and certification process meticulously. A description of these processes, prepared by the Director of the Memphis In-school NYC program, appears in Appendix H.

Although the age group of the experimental group was younger than usual NYC age group, the normal processes of the Memphis NYC were utilized. This process also included the usual administrative and payroll activities of the Memphis NYC. The research team selected the work sites, which were atypical for NYC placement, since they were after-school day care centers in poverty areas. The research team assumed full responsibility for data collection and analysis.

Two kinds of data were collected and analyzed to assess the effects of this demonstration effort:

1. Personality assessment data on the 14/15 year-old experimental group and on the two control groups;
2. External source data, consisting of school grades, school absences and tardiness, juvenile court contacts, known pregnancies, and on-job performance evaluations.

The selected experimental group of 14/15 year-old black girls were selected through the normal NYC process, and were given work assignments as assistants to teachers and leaders in after-school day care centers in poverty neighborhoods. They were directed by job supervisors in each center, and participated in regular discussion-interaction groups.

A group of typical 16/18 year-old black female In-school NYC youths served as one control group, (older controls).

A group of 14/15 year-old black girls, selected from the same population as the experimental group, but who participated neither in work activities nor in peer support groups, served as a second control group, (younger controls).

All three of the groups were tested, studied and evaluated, in order to assess the hypothesis by identifying similarities and

differences in outcomes. The study focused on a 9-month time span, beginning November 6, 1972, and ending August 10, 1973. Longer-range effectiveness studies still remain to be performed.

The most generally consistent finding of this study is that the experimental group and the older working control group maintained their levels of functioning. This maintenance outcome was most noticeable in school grades, good self concepts, and the individuals' sense of control of their own destinies as opposed to feeling at the mercy of fate, chance or luck. By contrast, the younger control group and those who dropped out of the program (particularly the younger ones) diminished in their levels of functioning in the same areas.

The positive outcomes for the experimental group become significant when these are contrasted with the changes in a negative direction found among the younger controls (who were provided with neither work nor peer-group supports). Similar negative changes also characterized the leavers from the program. The findings thus suggest that the current project had a substantial impact.

In brief then, the placement of 14/15 year-old black adolescent girls in a youth employment program, supported by peer interaction groups, produced positive outcomes for those included in the program. At the same time, those who were not included in the program (or who dropped out) showed negative changes in school grades and self concepts, as well as an increased perception of themselves as being at the mercy of chance or luck rather than controlling their own destinies.

II. Summary and Recommendations

A. Findings

The body of this report is a review of all data generated in the course of the study, together with appropriate statistical analysis and discussion of implications. The following specific findings are regarded by the research team as critically important for further research or demonstration as well as for their policy implication for black female youth employment programs.

1. The experimental subjects maintained their school grades as well as their levels of psychological strength. The comparable 14/15 year-olds declined, as did all leavers*from both the experimental and and older control group. The maintenance of level in psychological areas included their locus of control (internal versus external orientation), and their self concept. This is contrasted with other controls in the study, who showed gradual to spectacular negative changes in these areas.

2. While school grade levels for the subjects of this study showed the above maintenance pattern clearly, juvenile court data and reported pregnancy data did not discriminate among the experimental and control subjects. For further discussion, see Section VI.A, D, and E.

3. By the end of the first six months of the project, the work performance of the experimental group could not be distinguished from the work performance of the older controls. This resulted from the younger subjects maintaining a comparatively even level of work performance, while the older group started out at a superior level, but gradually declined. For further discussion, see Section VI.F.

---

*The word "leavers" is used in this report to describe those subjects who left the program by administrative termination or by voluntary withdrawal before May, 1973. By contrast, those who stayed in the program beyond that date are described as "remainers."

4. The experimentals were more significantly developed in the upwardly mobile character of their future job choices when they entered the program, than were the comparable younger controls. Specific job choices of the experimental group tended more in the direction of such occupations as nursing and teaching, which are generally associated with higher educational attainment. The research team feels that this can be explained, at least in part, by the fact that the experimental group were the select among the total potential population. This same upward mobility in job choice was also true of the older control group, as might be expected as the result of both age and the selection process. However in both groups, those who remained in the program were significantly more developed than those who left it. During the school year also, the experimentals maintained their level of functioning in the areas of self concept and the locus of control, while the younger controls and the leavers changed significantly in a negative direction.

5. A special aspect of personality change is described by the research team as "summer syndrome," since this change was most apparent during the school vacation period. While the leavers and the younger controls increased in identification with their basic reference group - black inner-city youth - the experimentals did not do so. This is highly significant in light of the fact that all groups started at approximately the same level when they entered the program. For further discussion, see Section VII.B.

6. The research team hypothesizes that the success of the experimental group is related to the peer group model, and the black female who served as leader of that group. This demonstration effort was unable to

test these factors directly or completely, since no totally comparable control group was available. A younger control group of comparable age existed, which was supplied with neither work experience nor peer interaction groups. However, no control group was available to test a model in which subjects of the same age would be at work, but not have peer interaction supports. Further, it was found that the younger control group was not drawn from an identical population as to a number of psychological and social variables, probably due to the NYC selection process. It will be recalled that the selection process was not within the control of the research team. A recommendation on this subject is made in Part B of this Section.

7. A wide range of evidence in this study strongly suggested many key factors in the backgrounds and relationships of black adolescent girls which inhibit or promote success in youth employment programs. This is more fully expanded in Section VII.B. Among these many factors, the research team describes one as a "moderately pushy mother."

8. A notable difference emerged between the experimentals who remained in the program and those who left or were terminated. The remainers showed more significant attitudes associated with upward mobility. These attitudes included a feeling of being liked by family and friends, acceptance of their mothers as they really are, and realistic understanding of the work requirements for their occupational goals.

9. Many other factors have also emerged in the course of this study which may provide a basis for predicting a youth's success in an employment program. Since many youth employment programs are similar to NYC in their selection and placement processes, it seems logical to assume that certain kinds of teenagers will have high success potential in such programs, while others will have a low success potential. Many demographic

and personality data were generated which can contribute to identification of potentially successful adolescents when they apply to enter a youth employment program. These predictors can be utilized to develop and test an instrument which will have general applicability in the youth employment selection process. For further discussion see Section VIII.B.

10. The research team has accumulated data on black adolescent girls and their families which may well be the most intensive and significant body of data on this age group thus far accumulated for the Manpower Administration. For further discussion, see Section VII.B.

B. Recommendations

In view of the above findings, based on a considerable body of data, a number of recommendations to the Manpower Administration appear logical, and are herewith forwarded.

1. The experimental group, who showed significant maintenance effects, should be followed for a period of several years, in order to assess the maintenance or enhancement of these positive outcomes over time.

2. An additional study should be undertaken of the younger controls (who did not participate in the program and showed negative effects) in order to determine if work supports and peer interaction supports can reverse these effects.

3. In order to definitively assess the findings of the current study, further efforts should be undertaken to study the differential effects of:

    a. Work supports together with peer interaction supports for 14/15 year-old black girls;
    b. Work supports without peer interaction supports, for the same age group;
    c. Neither work supports nor peer interaction supports, for the same age group.

4. It is clear that youth employment programs, do in fact select or "cream" youth with a high potential for success. However, it is also clear that this selectivity is not necessarily conscious or systematic. It is maintained here that "creaming" is a useful procedure, which should be performed in a systematic and deliberate fashion. The data from the present study have identified personal, familial and behavioral characteristics of black female adolescents who are successful in youth employment programs as they now exist, as well as characteristics of those youth who prove not to be successful. The research team believes that a selection instrument can be developed and tested. The implications of such an instrument, which could pre-identify successful youth, would be extremely important to the Manpower Administration, and would contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of youth employment programs.

5. Literature search reveals little or no basic data about the occupational choice-making process of adolescents. Theory suggests that the adolescent, between the ages of 12 and 18, is involved in a choice-making process which affects his life. Manpower programs could best be constructed if the stages in the occupational choice-making process in early and late adolescence were clearly identified and understood. Youth could then be matched with relevant programs based on their current stage of development in this process. Such an effort is recommended.

6. The present study has determined that the summer is a time of negative change for those adolescents not involved in youth employment programs, while those so involved maintain their gains. This "summer syndrome" should be studied more thoroughly.

7. If an effective instrument for the selection of potentially successful youth is developed and utilized, youth employment programs will be more effective. However, such a selection process will also eliminate or reject some youth. These youth who are not accepted will be those who cannot succeed in existing youth employment programs. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that research and demonstration efforts be undertaken to develop special new programs for such youth.

III. Selective Review of Relevant In-school NYC Research

"The Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) program is a manpower program authorized by the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964, as amended (42USC2740). The program is intended to provide paid training and work experience and supportive services needed to youths of low income families to encourage them to resume or continue schooling or to assist them to develop their maximum occupational potential and to obtain regular competitive employment." (U.S. Congress, 1973)

The program had a two-fold objective in its original intent:

1. Part-time employment, on-the-job training, and useful work experience for students from low-income families currently enrolled in grades 9 - 12, or whose age is that of students in such grades, and who need earnings to enable them to continue or resume school. The in-school and summer programs of NYC were designed to meet this objective.
2. An out-of-school youth component was to provide useful work and training (which was to include sufficient basic education and on-the-job training) to help unemployed, underemployed or low-income persons over 16 to develop their maximum occupational experience and to obtain regular competitive employment.

The intended NYC target population was described by one or more of the following characteristics according to the NYC Manual, 1966:

1. Potential dropouts
2. Poor school attendance
3. Lack of motivation
4. Less than average school achievement
5. Emotional or attitudinal problems
6. Frequent disciplinary problems
7. Language deficiencies

Later (in 1972) DOL issued additional guidelines which listed 21 characteristics which were common to potential dropouts and urged

examination of these in selection by NYC sponsors. (See Appendix A)

However, the GAO review of available studies and data on both types of NYC programs concluded that "... participating in the NYC program had no significant effect on whether a youth from a low-income family continued in school and that program sponsors generally had not considered an applicant's dropout potential in determining eligibility." (U.S. Congress, 1973)

A review of the current research on NYC may be found in the literature (U.S. DOL, 1970) and will therefore not be included here. However, findings relevant to this study will be summarized or are mentioned in other contexts in this section. It should be noted that some of the reported findings appear contradictory.

1. There has been real benefit to NYC participants, even if it has been little more than providing a small income to more than 2 million impoverished youth since the inception of the program, thus indirectly lessening the hardship of continued school attendance.
2. There has been considerable question whether NYC was in fact reaching the most disadvantaged eligible youth, although the great numbers and proportion of black urban girls (who have the highest unemployment among youth) might be an argument against this notion.

3. There are some indicators, but not much data, to suggest that NYC exerts a holding-in-school power.

4. NYC participation permitted enrollees to spend more on school expenses and thus afford a higher participation in school activities.

5. A significant number of youth excluded from NYC programs, and their parents, felt this exclusion

to have a negative effect on finances as well as on opportunity to learn skills and improve self concept.

6. Most NYC enrollees failed one or more grades before leaving school, where they received neither the education nor the counseling they needed. Although NYC gave them an opportunity to avoid another failure, the program did not provide the remedial education or extended counseling which the youth required.

7. NYC participation (according to one study) did not have a favorable effect on school achievement, attitude toward school, attitude toward teachers or toward future aspirations.

Most available studies appear to focus on single-variable outcomes, notably remaining in school.

Staying in school (high school graduation), however, as Freeburg and Reilly (Freeburg, 1971) point out, is only one of many possible program effectiveness criteria. Although studies in the latter 1960's were more adequate in moving toward precisely defined outcomes, there remains a significant void in true experimental studies as opposed to weaker descriptive survey studies. There is a lack of a broad spectrum of possible measures for assessment of various criteria or stated rationales.

A University of Wisconsin study (Somers, 1970) did indicate that greatest NYC program effect in terms of high school graduation was found among American Indians and black females. Furthermore, the Wisconsin evaluation of NYC programs recommended "intensive quality counseling" to channel NYC enrollees' new attitudes toward work into employment after graduation. Without such counseling the NYC jobs might encourage students to drop out of school.

Ozgediz (Ozgediz, 1973) suggests a 10-step "Y" framework for analyzing in-school NYC programs. One of the components suggested for inclusion in this model for NYC programs, is counseling. He states, "While most programs recognize the importance of counseling, these activities are generally not planned, implemented, monitored, evaluated or documented in any systematic way."

Perhaps a move in the direction of going beyond demographic outcome studies, as well as following the previously mentioned recommendation of utilizing intensive counseling, was the MARC exploratory project (Wallace, 1972). The development of peer group support network presents the potential of being a powerful mechanism for enabling young black women to develop more adequate job orientations. This project was a group stimulation and guidance model which included rap groups led by project staff.

In this context, the current study explores both issues emerging from the above review, i.e. the assessment of multi-dimensional behavioral outcomes for NYC enrollees and a project model which incorporates group counseling.

IV. Statement of the Hypothesis

The question under examination in the present study therefore, was whether the NYC work model would be useful to black female teenagers who were incorporated into the program at an earlier age than the NYC norm. It was hypothesized, first, that the introduction into an in-school work program at ages 14 and 15 would show positive outcomes in work performance, school grades, interpersonal factors, and appropriate social behavior.

It was also hypothesized that additional supports, if provided, would strengthen the potentially positive outcomes. Regular peer groups with the leadership assistance of a black female who could serve as a role model, was hypothesized to be a useful support.

It was noted in the "Operational Narrative and Project Design,"* that there is an increasing incidence of school dropouts, accompanied by a corresponding increase in unemployment, among 16 to 19 year-old black girls in urban settings. Many of the reasons generally forwarded to explain this phenomenon include problems which exist in the formal education system. Such problems are often described as the possible irrelevance of the education received in relation to the future job world, the school culture as antithetical to the culture or subculture of the student, the complex bureaucracy of the educational system which often renders it incapable of responding to individual needs, etc.

However, it was noted in the "Operational Narrative and Project Design" that the above factors reflect systemic problems within educational systems and are difficult or impossible to deal with on the part of external forces. The project therefore approached what was felt could be dealt with, namely individual student attitude, behavior and motivation. It was hypothesized that when systemic forces in school and other systems come into play, the provision of in-school work and other supports would counteract such forces, and that those

*Grant, MPRD 42-47-73-01, September 25, 1972

forces would not therefore find fertile ground to convert the potential dropout age 14/15 to actual dropout age 16/19.

With continuing evidence that unemployed black teenagers represent a substantial segment of national unemployment, and with continuing concern about retention in school and the development of job-related skills, it appeared evident that the exploration of supports especially designed to assist appropriate behavior and motivation would be useful. The formal school system is a continuing institutional factor in the lives of young black teenagers. But so, too, is the In-school NYC program for many of them.

However, as indicated in Section III above, little research has been directed at identifying the effective components of any sound program which contributes to the motivation of the student who is enrolled in an in-school NYC program.

It appeared therefore, that it would be useful to identify the characteristics of students so employed, and to identify the unique characteristics of those students who displayed motivation toward success, toward upward mobility, and toward remaining in school for the purpose of enhancing future earnings and self-support.

It was also felt that it would be highly significant if additional specialized supports could be identified which contributed added motivation and strength to student committment to the above patterns of behavior.

Thus, this project was designed to identify student success characteristics and also to test the effectiveness of specific supports added to the normal In-school NYC program.

V. Field Study Research Design

In the spring of 1972, discussions took place among the research team, the Memphis Board of Education In-school Neighborhood Youth Corps staff, and a representative of the Research and Demonstration Division, Manpower Administration, Department of Labor. These conversations eventuated in the research-demonstration design of the project.

Incorporated into the approach at that stage were the following:

1. A field demonstration, rather than a true experimental study, would be undertaken.
2. The demonstration targets would be 14/15 year-old black girls, two years younger than the normal NYC population.
3. The demonstration target population, together with such control groups as would be formed, would all be in school. The outcomes to be explored would include personal functioning and remaining in school. Entry into the job market was not to be considered.
4. After-school day care agencies would be used as job sites for the experimental group, which would be atypical for the Memphis In-school NYC program.
5. The experimentals would be assistant group leaders and assistant teachers at these work sites, and would be placed in these agencies in groups of 6 or 8 per agency.
6. Selected supports would be supplied to the experimental population, including peer interaction groups under the the leadership of an appropriate black female role model.
7. The work experience, supported by the peer interaction groups led by role models, would be dealt with as one variable and no other variables would be controlled or investigated.

8. The normal Memphis In-school NYC selection and monitoring procedures would be used, and the research team would not participate in this aspect of the project.

9. The after school day care agencies would be solely responsible for the selection, training and supervision of the peer group leaders/job supervisors.

10. The research team would:
    a. Collect data formally on the experimentals and controls as to school grades, absence and tardiness, juvenile court contacts, pregnancy, job supervisor ratings, and psychological, sociological and demographic variables;
    b. Collect data informally on the function and style of the agencies, the peer group leaders/job supervisors, and the content and general development of the peer interaction groups.
    c. In order to avoid distortion of the peer interaction experience, the research team would not observe, participate or otherwise interfere.
    d. Participant observation was not considered feasible because of the age of the experimental group.

11. It was agreed that the Memphis Board of Education, sponsor of the Memphis In-school NYC program would become the contractor. Social Service Delivery Systems would become the research sub-contractor to the Memphis Board of Education, and would assume full responsibility for the accuracy of the data.

12. Replicability of the project design in other programs would be a desireable outcome.

As a result of these conversations, a formal proposal was prepared for the Manpower Administration and accepted. The detail of the field study thus approved, follows.

Three groups of black adolescent girls were formed.

The first of these groups ("experimental group") was to consist of fifty 14/15 year-old girls then enrolled in school.* The age range of this group when formed, was from 13 years, 6 months to 15 years, 10 months as of November, 1972. They would be selected by the normal local NYC process, which sought recommendations from school guidance counselors in schools located in urban poverty areas, and then received applications, certified and hired the applicants.

Another group would be a control group of 14/15 year-old black adolescent girls ("younger control group") attending the identical schools. These girls would not be employed in the NYC program. This group wouldbe studied as well, and receive payment only for the days on which they undertook testing, which would occur three times during the course of the project. The age range of this group when formed, was from 13 years, 11 months, to 15 years, 10 months, as of November, 1972.

In total, the Memphis NYC office received applications from 104 girls of this age. Normal NYC In-school project procedures were utilized, and the research team had no part in the selections. The Coordinators at the NYC In-school Project, together with their Director, in conference with school counselors, utilized selection methods and procedures as in the regular NYC In-school program.** Fifty experimentals were selected through this process. Fifty-one of those not selected agreed to participate in the younger control group. There were no known identifiable differences among the 104 candidates, and those not selected were omitted only on the basis of lack of job slots.

Notification of enrollees was handled by school counselors and NYC Coordinators in their normal fashion.

*A table of birthdates of all three groups appears in Appendix G.
**Attention is called to the description of the selection procedure in the Memphis In-school NYC program as outlined by its Director, which appears as Appendix H.

An additional group ("older control group") consisted of 50 active NYC In-school students, who were part of the normal on-going NYC program for 16/18 year-olds. The age range of this group was from 16 years, 3 months, to 20 years, 3 months as of November, 1972.

Data Base

Demographic data was collected on all subjects. Periodic psychological and personality testing, periodic evaluations by work supervisors, analysis of grade point averages and other school information, analysis of Juvenile Court contacts, and monitoring of reported pregnancy, were all undertaken with both the experimentals and the two control groups. Testing dates were: November 11, 1972, May 12, 1973, and August 4, 1973.

The research established a baseline of information regarding the experimentals and controls. This baseline information included sociological and demographic data, a variety of psychological and attitudinal tests, and in-depth interviews with a sample of the population and their parents. Attitude and personality change was assessed by periodic retesting of both experimentals and controls. Identification and analysis were undertaken of whatever changes might occur.

During the course of the project, periodic work evaluations were secured from work supervisors. In addition, simple records were maintained by the leaders of the peer interaction groups. These were reviewed and reported.

School data were secured on all experimentals and controls for the year preceding the inception of the project and also for the year of the project. These data included grade point averages, and tardiness and absence records.

Similarly, for the school year preceding the project and the school year in which the project took place, Juvenile Court records were examined and evaluated. The incidence of reported pregnancy during the project year was studied.

Work Sites

The selection of work sites was performed by the research team, during a two month period of intensive investigation. This process began by the research team reviewing its combined 56 years of experience with various agencies in the Memphis community. This was followed by a series of informal observational visits to these agencies. Some agencies were screened out during this process, and formal discussions were undertaken with the remainder. During this process, the following selection criteria were utilized by the research team:

1. Stability and reliability of the agency.
2. Capability of the agency for supplying supervisors and group leaders who were effective role models for the experimental group.
3. Agency interest and capability for providing after-school day care for 6 - 12 year-olds.

As a result of these investigations and evaluations, the following seven agencies were selected as the first group of work sites:

Operation Action, Simmons Estates site:

A recreation and informal education program, located in a two-year-old public housing project characterized by a high level of racial tension.

Operation Action, Goodwill Homes site:

The after-school day care component of a comprehensive neighborhood center providing a wide range of recreation education, day care and social services to low-income families in a black neighborhood of diverse socio-economic levels.

Girls' Club, North Seventh Street branch:
An agency traditionally serving a black girl population, and offering recreational, educational, and job-related services to girls in groups.
Girls' Club, St. Thomas branch:
An outreach branch of the above Girls' Club, primarily servicing an adjacent low-cost public housing project.
Headstart, Walnut Park site:
A Community Action Agency pre-school day care center, newly expanding its service to a school age population during after-school hours. It is located in a Federal rent-support housing development.
Headstart, Warren Apartments site:
Similar program to the Walnut Park site, but located in a different low-income neighborhood.
Headstart, Riverview site:
An expanded day care program in South Memphis, primarily servicing a low-income area of single family dwellings.

The selection of the experimental and control groups, and of the work sites themselves was completed, and work began November 6, 1972. This followed shortly after notification from the Manpower Administration to begin project operations as of October 26, 1972.

Training and Orientation

Appropriate training and orientation sessions were held under the joint auspices of the NYC office and the research team, for after-school day center directors, job supervisors and peer group leaders. Two such general sessions were held, following a series of preliminary orientation sessions in each of the seven agencies. These sessions dealt with the goals and expectations of the program, the roles of the NYC staff, agency staff, and the research team, and also with administrative concerns.

The above sessions were also the culmination of the orientation period for the Field Worker for the project.* She was carefully selected by the research team. She was a 24 year-old black female, college trained in the social sciences. She was selected as a highly appropriate role model, being an attractive-looking person, outgoing and verbal, married to a former professional basketball player who was currently working as a recreation director in Memphis. Her primary function during the course of the project was to serve as the link between the research team and the peer interaction group leaders, the individual experimentals themselves, the NYC staff of Coordinators, and the counselors in the schools from which the experimentals were drawn.

During this early period as well, careful liason was established with the guidance counselors and the principals in each of the schools which the experimental group members attended. This was supported by appropriately involving administrative personnel in the Board of Education itself. These efforts culminated in a major orientation meeting which was attended by all of the principals, guidance counselors and Board of Education personnel involved. At this session, the goals of the project were again reviewed, and agreement reached that the school and Board of Education personnel would associate themselves cooperatively with the research. This meeting also served to legitimize the visits of the Field Worker to the schools, and the connection of the research team members with the schools and the Board of Education.

During this period, and throughout the project, substantial and willing cooperation has been offered by the NYC office, Director and Coordinators. In addition, school guidance counselors and

---

*The writers wish to express their appreciation to Ms. Joan Logan, Field Worker, for her significant contributions in the operational phases of this project.

central office personnel of the Memphis Board of Education have been cooperative and helpful.

Description of Program

As her regular assignment, the Field Worker visited each work site weekly, attended peer interaction sessions occasionally, monitored and followed up absenteeism, assisted the seven agency directors with the solving of problems directly related to the demonstration effort, and provided feedback and reportage to the research team at regularly scheduled weekly staff meetings.

The experimentals worked regularly as assistant group leaders and assistant teachers in the agencies. They met for peer interaction sessions once weekly during the school year and twice weekly during the summer.

The atmosphere of the peer interaction group sessions was relatively free and open. The groups met informally, and generally in physical locations different from the actual places in which they performed their work. During the early phases of these sessions, the leader found it necessary to open most of the discussions. However, as the groups and leaders became more familiar with each other, these sessions became more self-generating and the leader assumed a less directive role.

The subjects discussed were in a fairly narrow range of interests. Most predominant among the subjects discussed were clothes, sex, boy friends and date behavior. Discussions focusing around school subjects were comparatively brief and focused largely on criticizing school experiences. During the summer period, there were sometimes discussion of the failings of their job supervisors and some expressions of dissatisfaction with working conditions.

It is noteworthy than an early period of stiffness, during which the leader was required to take most of the initiative, repeated itself briefly at the beginning of the summer period. The fact that the peer interaction group leaders were largely new personnel is regarded by the research team as the reason for this.

During the course of the project, a number of changes and modifications occurred in the format. Although the project was originally projected for the duration of the school year 1972-73, the late start (November, 1972) impelled the extension of the project for a special program during the summer of 1973, which was approved by both the Memphis NYC and by the Manpower Administration. The rationale for this modification was that the November beginning involved only 5½ months of work for the experimentals, and thus limited unduly the research potential for the project. It was also felt that a special summer work segment would provide additional knowledge and insight, because of the change of life styles which students undergo during the summer school vacation period. In keeping with normal Memphis NYC procedures, the work week was extended from its school-year model of 8 hours per week, to the summer model of 25 hours per week. The duration of the summer segment of the study was from June 18 until August 10, 1973.

Only one work site change occurred during the summer component, but the time schedule provided major changes for all the experimentals. The scheduled sessions for peer interaction were conducted twice weekly during the summer as opposed to once weekly during the school year segment of the program. The work style also changed during the summer period. The agencies universally conducted day camp programs during the school vacation. As a result, the experimentals served as group leaders for small groups of younger children during a round of varied scheduled activities each day. The one change in work site involved the dropping of the Riverview site of Headstart, and moving that group of experimentals to DeSoto Park, a site operated by the Memphis Park Commission. This change was made necessary by the fact that the

Riverview Headstart site did not conduct a summer program.

A change in the approach to the peer interaction group leaders was undertaken in the summer modification. During the November-May period the leaders were supplied by the after-school day care agencies who selected appropriate role models in this capacity. During the summer period, however, a group of leaders was recruited by the research team, and trained and monitored by the research team. There were several reasons for this change in the experimental design. Feedback from the Field Worker, as well as continuing conferences with agency directors, were the sources of the information on which the research team based this change. This information included evidence of role conflicts in the agencies, between staff members serving as job directors issuing orders and instruction, and these same personnel serving as peer interaction group leaders where they were required to be open and permissive. An additional difficulty resulted from changes of personnel and work assignment within the agencies, thus producing a situation of discontinuity in the peer interaction group leader in some instances. In addition, in the exigencies of normal agency operation, staff was sometimes shifted from one responsibility to another, thus depriving the experimentals of some continuity of both job supervision and peer interaction group leadership. As the result of the above findings, the research team undertook a more direct control of the peer interaction group leaders during the summer period. This left job supervision to the agencies while keeping training and monitoring functions with the research team. A statement on the peer group leaders, together with a narrative description of the subject content of the groups appears in Appendix C.

Other Data

Changes also occurred in the pre-summer composition of the study population. While the younger control group remained constant at 51, there were 12 leavers in the 14/15 year-old experimental group of 50, and 8 leavers in the older control group of 45.

Data on the leavers was also accumulated, similar to the data on the experimentals and controls. Analysis of the data on the leavers yielded valuable comparative information when compared to the remainers. This is fully reported below.

Table 1*
Analysis of Leavers by Cause
Prior to Beginning of Summer Program**

	14/15 year-old Experimentals	16/18 year-old Controls
Voluntary withdrawals	5	5
Involuntary withdrawals, financial ineligibility	4	0
Involuntary withdrawals, discharge by NYC for cause	3	3
Total	12	8

The arrival of broad-scale school busing in Memphis in mid-January of 1973 posed potential problems. Although civil disorder and interruption of school did not ensue, pairing of schools affected four of the schools attended by experimentals, and 18 of the experimentals faced possible work difficulties because of changed distances from new schools, time-travel, etc. Adequate preparation by the project's field worker resulted in no disturbance of work schedules.

At the same time, the ensuing semester was characterized by high absenteeism universally throughout the Memphis school system. This increased absenteeism found its parallel among the experimentals and controls, which is detailed in Table 5.

---

*The writers wish to express their appreciation to Dr. Rebecca F. Guy for her significant contributions in the compilation, analysis and interpretation of the body of data in this report.

**The office of the NYC In-school program has supplied an official list of all leavers, together with detailed reasons. This appears in Appendix H. It will be noted that the numbers and categories indicated vary from those appearing in the above table and in the balance of this report. This is explained by the fact that the numbers utilized in the above table refer to those who dropped out as reflected in their not participating in the testing sessions. The official NYC list refers to those terminated as per the official NYC records.

In summary, one experimental group and two control groups were recruited, and psychological and personality testing was administered to all members of the three groups. Six hours of testing was included in the total of 456 hours of work experience. All data pertaining to school grades, juvenile court contacts, pregnancy, and work performance were secured on members of all three groups. This data forms the core of the research content and is reported herein, in Sections VI. and VII.

However, before reviewing the research data, the peer interaction groups and their Leaders/Role Models are to be described.

Peer Interaction Groups

Peer interaction groups were introduced as a component of the project design to encourage the experimentals to share experiences with each other, and to provide a forum for the introduction of meaningful and relavant information by the group leader/role model. The peer interaction group, which included all workers in any given agency, usually numbered 7 girls. The group met once per week during the school year and twice per week during the summer session. The group met in their agencies in a room designated for the peer interaction experience. Attempts were made to have the room furnished with comfortable chairs which would aid the free flow of conversation, and this did occur in three settings. In the other four settings, normal classroom type furniture was used. When weather permitted, peer interaction sessions were often moved outdoors, and conducted sitting in a circle on the grass. All agency settings were adjacent to grassy parklike settings.

The primary function of the group leader/role model in the peer interaction group was to guarantee the maximum possible participation of each girl in the discussion itself. Topics for the peer interaction group were generated both by the girls and the group leaders. In the initial stages of the project (first 2 months) the majority of the discussions were initiated by the leaders. As the project went into succeeding months, more initiative for discussions was assumed by the girls. During

the summer session, in several of the groups, all initiative was assumed by the girls.

In the peer interaction groups, there were 12 major areas of discussion which were identified by the leaders during the year. The 12 most discussed topics are listed below, and are ranked in decreasing order of frequency and intensity.

1. Concerns about birth control, the pill, family planning;
2. Concerns about sex - premarital sex, petting, sex in books and movies;
3. Concerns about male-female relationships-dating, boy friends, friends;
4. Discussion of field trips, both before and after;
5. Concerns about the work site, the job, and the discussion group itself;
6. Concerns about personal hygiene and appearance - grooming, makeup, hair styles;
7. Concerns about fashion, clothes, shopping;
8. Concerns about the future - plans for jobs and college;
9. Concerns about prostitution and pimps;
10. Concerns about drugs;
11. Movies;
12. Concerns about marriage and weddings.

In addition to the above topics which arose naturally in most groups, several topics were a focus of individual discussion in some groups.

From the reports of the leaders, discussions tended to be progressively more free-flowing, with slow initial starts during November and December 1972, to moderate to high involvement in January and February 1973, and active involvement in interpersonal exchanges in late spring and summer. The flavor and feeling of these peer interaction groups can best be conveyed through a series of situational vignettes which were recorded and transmitted by the leaders to the research team during the course of the project.

"There was one particular girl that Charlesetta and

I were worried about. Rubystine always seemed to be a little too quiet and a little too afraid. After each discussion session a rough looking young man about 20 years old would pick her up on a motor cycle. During the sessions the girls would sometimes tease Rubystine about her old man. Charlesetta and I discussed her privately, and we both felt she was a little afraid of this guy. He must have been at least 21 years old. One day, having moved the discussion session outside because it was sunny and pleasant, the subject of prostitution came up, and Rubystine looked more withdrawn than ever. We began talking about why women become prostitutes, and Rubystine spoke up and said maybe they were afraid. She did not say anything else for the rest of the session. After the meeting, I asked one of the girls about Rubystine's family, and found out that she had two older brothers. At the next meeting of the group I waited until the meeting was over and stayed to talk to Rubystine. Surprisingly she brought up the subject of James (her boyfriend) and that he bought things for her and that now he was expecting her to "do things for him". I advised Rubystine to first tell her brother and if that did not work we would have to go to the proper authority. The next session she told me it worked and that James had stopped following her around and threatening her. I asked her why she had not told her family at first, she said it was because she didn't want her mother to find out. But, she realized it would be better for her mother to find out then than for her to do things she didn't like." (Leaders: Charlesetta J and Ethel M)

"In the beginning phase of the South Memphis group, the girls were extremely indifferent to our effort. We could begin to see our progress as the girls little by little sought out our help, frequently with no direct encouragement from us. A typical example was when Cora, one of our quieter members, approached us with her concerns about birth control. Cora pulled Lois (a leader) aside and stated that both she and her sister wanted the pill but did not know how to go about getting it. She indicated she was involved sexually with her boy friend, did not want a baby, and had tried to talk about it with her parents. Her father was totally against it. We suggested that she talk about this with her mother, who was a little more understanding, and offered our help to and through the birth control clinic. Much to our surprize, Cora was able to modify her parents' attitude and eventually got the pill. She verbally related both her own and her parents appreciation for our concern and help with this problem." (Leader: Lois H.)

"Field trips had become a regular function of our peer interaction group. We would plan at least one per month. We noticed on several occasions that Judy did not attend the trips but had said she would attend. We asked why she did not go, and she said her mother was very strict and would not allow her to go. We asked if we could talk to her mother with her, and she thought this would be a good idea. We were able, after talking to her mother, with Judy, to convince her mother that the trips were harmless. She then okayed the June trip for Judy and all the other trips as well. After one of the movies, Judy thanked us for talking to her mother, and said she really like the rap sessions. She said if we had not talked to her mother, her mother would not let her go anywhere." (Leaders: Linda W and Sheridan B.)

"Dorothy usually never showed up for discussion groups on pay day. One day some of the girls were talking and mentioned the reason. The problem was that Dorothy's mother always tried to take her money. In the next group discussion session I briefly mentioned the problem of having your parents think you should give them all of your money. We discussed this and found out that most of the girls would not give their parents even lunch money for their brothers and sisters when the parents did not have the money to give the brothers and sisters. They believed they were not supposed to share. In our session we brought out points about treating people kindly and how they would usually respond. I suggested that Dorothy volunteer to give her mother a small portion of her check and see if she stopped trying to take all of her money. The next week Dorothy came back and said her mother refused the money she offered her and said she only needed money sometimes. Dorothy said she felt closer to her mother because they hadn't really talked in a long time. Dorothy and her mother agreed that Dorothy would give her mother some money when her mother needed it." (Leader: Ethel T.)

"Marilyn is usually a lively and cheerful person. One day she came to the club and was not very cheerful. In the discussion group, Shirley and manoevered the questions around to find out why Marilyn was acting as she was. Marilyn stated that she was not sad or dreary, and that nothing was wrong. As the discussion progressed, we found out that Marilyn had had a car accident and was not getting any medical treatment. As the group broke up we also found that Marilyn's home situation was not happy. Her mother wanted her to leave the club and take care of her younger sisters and brothers. We immediately began to work on these problems. We had a talk with Marilyn's mother the next afternoon and with Marilyn also. Her mother was informed of what we had found out. Her mother was convinced to let Marilyn stay

in the program, and Marilyn was referred to medical treatment for the accident, through the local community hospital. Marilyn came to us and thanked us for helping her with her problems. She didn't jump all over us with praise, but she thanked us in her own way." (Leader: Donna R.)

"On the first day of discussion at one of the sites all of the girls came in very upset about the working conditions. At first they didn't want to talk about it, but when we kept at them they finally let it out. All the girls except one talked freely about the supervisors and the director, and the mistreatment that had occurred on the job. We had a talk with both the supervisor and the director and the very next day of discussion all the girls expressed how grateful they were because things had really changed. Brenda, the one I had called the leader of the group, told us it had helped a great deal because the supervisor told them that she wasn't aware of the situation and that she would like them to come to her from now on to talk about their problems and it seemed like they had broken a communication gap. As the group continued, we focused the conversation on how to deal with supervisors and what should workers say to supervisors when problems come up. We asked the girls to talk about the kind of problems that they had, and they mentioned several job related things, including work hours and the way in which the supervisor talked to them. The girls asked us if all supervisors talked the same way, and we said that some do and some don't. We also talked about what the worker should do when they are unhappy on the job." (Leader: Anita J.)

"One Friday afternoon, the discussion was centered around male/female relationship (boyfriends). Two of the girls, Janice and Cora, had been acting as isolates in the group. They would sit off to the side and never say anything. They were awfully hesitant to speak about this topic especially. After the discussion session broke up, Janice and Cora came to me to discuss their feelings about certain fellows that had an eye on them at school. However, Janice felt that the fellows at school were considered to be naive and silly. Janice, being a much more mature girl, but shy, felt she should be allowed to date older men. This was one of the problems she discussed with the other discussion leader and myself. She didn't want to bring this subject up openly, before the other girls. After several sessions of the discussion group, these two girls began to confide in us about other subjects. After a while, these two

girls began opening up verbally during the discussion sessions. However, they admitted they felt a little and safer talking to us outside of the group. Their conversation did increase during the discussion sessions, however, and by the end of the program, they were actively participating in discussions, though still not beginning them." (Leader: LaVerne B.)

"When I took over as discussion leader as well as supervisor, I felt that I should just talk about myself with the girls so that they could discover that I was not the distant person they had come to think of me as. There were yet difficulties because one of the girls(the ringleader) had negative influences on the group that prevented them from functioning. She had to be terminated and after that the girls became more receptive to work, the staff and me. They had no source of negative and false information, only the encouragement and praise that we had to give them. By this I mean, for example, allowing them to be part of the staff instead of a secondary, second group. The discussion sessions became more open and free-flowing, as the girls and I began to establish trust relationships. It was no longer necessary for me to start every conversation, and the girls would come in with problems that they had and begin the discussion session." (Leader: Marilyn B.)

"We could also see that we were making progress as the girls expressed more interest in our personal and private activities. For instance, toward the middle phase of the group, the girls questioned us extensively about our home and family, college life, etc. One of the girls, Jane, said she was scared that college would be too hard. We told her all about our courses and what a person really needed to get through college. We also came right out and told her that we thought she had the ability to succeed in college. After this Jane talked more positively about going to college. In fact, one day she announced in the session that she planned to enroll in LeMoyne-Owen and major in sociology because she wanted to learn more about people. Two of our girls then asked Lois if she had any children. When she answered no, the girls then asked if they could go and live with her. She invited them to visit with her sometime, at home. The same day when Lois's husband came to pick her up, the girls met him at the car and told him how much they wanted to come live with them. The conversation went something like this: "John, we wish we could come and be your and Lois's children. I bet it would be fun living with you all. Lois really knows how to understand us." (Leader: Laura C.)

"During one discussion session, Geraldine, one of the girls, wanted to know why they were forced to accept certain rules imposed upon them in school. This girl was considered a discipline problem at school. I was really amazed that she wanted to take the whole session to discuss this issue, as in the first few group sessions she had said nothing. At first Geraldine did not want anyone to take the time to discuss issues of this nature with her. Later, she even asked the other girls what they thought about the way teachers disciplined kids in school". (Leader: LaVerne B.)

"Rita was having family problems. First she didn't talk so much about it, but one particular day she seemed a little more upset about something. In the discussion group several of the girls asked her what was bothering her and she said her mother was very strict and ruled her with an iron fist. She said they couldn't even have a good mother-daughter relationship because she was taking everything out on Rita that Rita's father had done to her. The girls said they didn't feel this was right and that some of them had had the same kind of experiences. After the discussion session we suggested that Rita go home and try hard to talk with her mother and say exactly how she felt. It just so happened that we were supposed to go to the birth control clinic the next week and Rita would have to tell her mother about that also, and get permission. Rita did go home and talk to her mother, and told her about the trip to the birth control clinic. Her mother was all for it, and praised Rita for taking that kind of action. Rita seemed very happy because that somehow brought them much closer together." (Leader: Anita J.)

"I could see that the girls changed considerably over the summer. They began to identify with the discussion leaders. For one session we took the girls from the North Memphis group to one of the leaders' homes. The little things we take for granted, like food in the refrigerator and record player with records, a clean neat house, etc., fascinated these girls to death. They opened the refrigerator and saw all of the food Lois had in there and they couldn't stop talking about it. When they went into the den and and saw how beautifully decorated it was they praised Lois to death. They told her her home was clean and neat and how they really loved her home because they thought of their homes as being something different. They said Lois had a very sweet husband and most of them were without men in the house. They also wanted to talk about colleges and good professional jobs because they figured that was how

> Lois had got what she had. (Lois is a graduate student in the University of Tennessee School of Social Work). I remembered that at the beginning of the program when they found out we were college students, they didn't want to talk to us too much because they thought we were quite different from them. The discussion sessions changed when they found found out that they could talk to us like regular people, even though we were going to school. During the discussion session at Lois's house, they asked if they could get a house like this if they stayed in school. Lois told them that helps, and they could train themselves just like she did." (Leader: Laura C.)

> "One incident that we felt was especially helpful occurred when one of the girls who had a complex about her size and weight finally spoke in the group. Most of the time, she would keep her coat on while at work. We noticed this in her and started talking about appearance and about ways of improving one's looks in general in the discussion sessions. Lisa began participating in these conversations, and one day announced to the group that she was on a diet and losing weight. After a couple of weeks when the weight loss became very obvious, Lisa took off her coat during the group session. One week later, Lisa took off her coat during work." (Leaders: Linda W. and Sheridan B.)

It would seem appropriate here also to include some of the summary statements that were made by the group discussion leaders at the end of the project. The statements that follow are typical of statements made in final reports.

> "The sessions were someplace for the girls to relieve their frustrations and find answers to most of their questions and to find someone to talk to. The girls probably would have grown tired of working 5 hours a day, 5 days a week, doing the same old thing and going back to the same old place with the same old problems, and having no way to do anything about it. Many of the girls have confessed that the sessions have helped them with many personal and family problems, and that they learned many new things to keep them out of trouble. The girls really enjoyed taking trips, too. Not just for the sake of going, but to get out of their neighborhoods in order to see new and better places and things."

> "When the discussion groups started 10 weeks ago, these girls could be adequately described as 'stuck up'. They had their own ideas about what "nice" girls should and should not do. It was rather difficult for us to penetrate their tightly knit clique. They were silly, aggressive with each other, but passively aggressive with

outsiders, and spent most of their time letting off steam by verbally attacking those whom they disliked. Because these girls were unable to confront a real problem, they tended to overlook what really was getting to them, and talked about the personal attributes of the person related to the problem. For example, when we discussed the school busing issue, the girls talked about how the white kids talked, the clothes the white kids wore, etc. When we discussed their NYC jobs, they talked about the glasses their supervisors wear."

"Even though the group is not a hard core, poverty stricken group of girls, they have made considerable progress in the past few weeks. Some of the changes of attitude and expression are probably directly related to the discussion group. It is also evident that some of the girls may be taking inventory of their values. For instance, it seems that they are open to the opinion of others now than when we first got started. The girls are certainly more courteous and respectful toward each other. The most important changes in the girls include: one, being able to talk about embarrassing or awkward situations without laughing their way out of a discussion; two, being able to appreciate or place some value on non-material gains such as education and life experiences. In other words, these girls no longer seem to place clothes and outward appearance at the top of their value system. They are becoming aware of other ways in which a person can be judged other than by the lightness of skin or the price he pays for his clothes."

Group Leaders/Role Models

Each interaction group had two leaders. During the first phase of the project (November to June), the peer interaction leaders were under the supervision of the agencies at which the experimentals worked. During the summer phase, the leaders were under the supervision of the research team. Some changes took place in personnel with some leaders working in only one of the two phases, while others worked in both phases. However, no leader worked in both phases with the same group.

All group leaders were between 19 and 26 years of age, all were black females, all had some successful college experience, and many had successful work experiences. None had been pregnant out of wedlock, and none had dropped out of school.

The autobiographical sketches of five of the discussion leaders have been selected to be included at this point, in order to provide a general picture of the typical group leader.

Linda W. - 22 year-old black female, born in Clarksdale Mississippi and moved to Memphis in 1953. Parents were originally sharecroppers and remained staunch members of local Baptist church. Grandparents and extended family are living in and around Charleston Mississippi. Both parents have an 8th grade education, with the father currently a truck driver and the mother currently a housewife. This leader's educational experience included four year bachelor of arts degree with major in social welfare. Her previous work experience included telephone solicitor, group leader in a social agency, election poll worker, and assistant program director and teen worker at Girls' Club of Memphis. Miss W. was single with no children at the time of the project and planned to marry, undertake a career as a social worker, and raise a family.

Laura C. - 20 year-old black female born in Memphis, Tennessee. Her parents were born in Senatobia, Mississippi and moved to Memphis 1½ years after their marriage. At the time of the project, her mother was a housewife with a 10th grade education, and her father was a machine operator with an 8th grade education. Miss C graduated from Hamilton High School in Memphis, and was a junior at Memphis State University. Her work experience included being a day camp director with the Memphis Park Commission, a proof machine operator at a local bank, before becoming a group leader for this project. She was single with no children. She projected her future as a good professional job as a head nurse at some hospital, a big beautiful home, a very "deserving" husband, and one child.

Lois H. - 24 year-old black female. Born in Memphis, Tennessee the fourth child in a family of four. She had lived her entire life in Memphis. Both parents were born and raised in Mississippi. Her mother completed the 8th grade of school and was a domestic worker most of her work life. However, she recently completed

nurse's aide courses and was now employed as a nurse assistant at local convalescent home. Her father was self-taught, with less than two years of formal education, and was barely able to sign his name. He was an unskilled laborer, having remained with the same firm for over 20 years. Miss H. was a graduate with a B.A. degree from Lane College in Jackson, Tennessee and had completed five quarters of graduate study in social work at the University of Tennessee School of Social Work at the time of the project, expecting to receive her Masters in Social Work in June 1974. She had been a part-time sales girl, Park Commission supervisor, camp group leader, and a social worker with the Tennessee Welfare Department and with the Center for Retarded Children in Memphis. She was married with no children. Her future projection was to be university level professor in social welfare.

Minetta F. - age 26, black female, born in Shelby County Tennessee as were her parents. Her mother completed the 10th grade, and was currently employed as a seamstress. Her father finished the 12th grade and was currently employed as a warehouseman with a trucking company. Miss F. received her high school education in Memphis, and also received an Associate of Arts degree from Owen College and a Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology from LeMoyne-Owen College. Her work experience included employment as a clerk for Shelby County government, a Headstart teacher for 2½ years, and a social worker with the Community Day Care Association for 2 years. She was married with four children. Her future plans were to enter a Masters program in Guidance and Counseling and then to do industrial personnel relations work.

Anita J. - black female, age 19. born in Shelby County. Her mother was originally from Fisherville, Tennessee and her father from Cordova, Tennessee, both in Shelby County. Father had a third grade education and was a laborer at International Harvestor. Mother had an eleventh grade education, and was a licensed practical nurse at the local municipal hospital. Miss J. was currently a junior at Memphis State University. Her work experience included ward clerk at St. Jude's Hospital, work supervisor at day care program at Walnut Park Apartments, prior to becoming a group leader with this project. Her goals included working

for the government at some job that would provide travel outside the continental United States as well as finding a husband and settling down and raising a family, preferably in Memphis.

The above descriptions are typical of the types of group leaders who were employed in this project. Substantial education, middle class aspirations, highly developed sense of upward mobility, personal physical attractiveness, and ability to relate to younger girls in a positive supportive manner, were prime requisites in the selection of these leaders. The research team spent over 200 unit hours with the leaders, eliciting from them their attitudes, feelings, and factual written data concerning the nature of the interaction groups and the nature of the various interactive patterns which evolved. In the course of these discussions, a definition of the role of the group leader as seen by the leaders themselves, began to evolve. The following is a categorization of the elements which the various interaction group leaders identified as components of their job:

1. Open, understanding, and conceived of as a close friend by the girls in the groups;
2. Available for talking about anything and in almost any situation;
3. Productive, and able to carry out any promises that were made;
4. Able to have the girls feel that they are important and that they have a say in things that are happening;
5. Able to provide specific suggestions which will not leave the girls feeling helpless, lost or unneeded;
6. Able to plan specific projects;
7. Able to encourage participation and questions, and above all able to resolve difficulties which the girls face;
8. Able to record and evaluate the various things which happen in the groups;
9. Wanting to invest more than minimum required effort in relationships with girls;
10. Able to build trust in the relationship with the girls;
11. Able to conduct themselves in a firm ladylike manner so as to present an appropriate role model;
12. Able to create different types of experiences so as not to produce a boring discussion group experience.

VI. Data from External Sources

The data in this section will deal with descriptive and comparative findings secured from sources other than the subjects themselves. These sources include the school attended, the Memphis Board of Education, Juvenile Court, NYC files, and on-site work supervisors.

School Grades

Through the cooperation of appropriate high school counselors and other school personnel, who were very helpful in this respect, school grade data on almost all subjects were made available. These data were obtained for the end of academic years 1971-1972, the period prior to the entrance of the subjects into the study, as well as the end of 1972-73 academic year, the period which coincides to a significant extent with Phase I of the project. The grade data (average unweighted) may be considered accurate inasmuch as it was obtained directly from school records rather than subjects' self-report. No comparable achievement data was available since the local school system's achievement testing procedures yield incomplete data on different measures. These tap various areas of school content which are difficult, if not impossible to compare.

Table 2

1971-72 School Year Grades (on a 4 point scale)

	Mean*	S.D.**
14/15 year-old experimentals (N=47)***	2.40	0.76
16/18 year-old controls (N=38)	2.25	0.82
14/15 year-old controls (N=45)	2.01	0.82

*Mean is the arithmetic average.
**Standard Deviation (S.D.) is a measure of variability within a group of numbers. A large S.D. indicates that the numbers range widely along a scale; a small S.D. indicates more of a clustering around the mean. It is thus a measure of "scatter" or distribution of numbers.
***The number of cases in the groups on this table is not the total number of cases because some grade data were unavailable through the school system for one or both years.

Appropriate tests of significance* in the comparison of the pre-study grade data indicates that the grade point averages of these groups are significantly different from each other ($p < .07$). A further analysis indicates the important difference ($p < .05$) is between the two 14/15 year-old groups. The average grades of the experimental group are significantly higher at the outset of the project than the grades of the 14/15 year-old controls, suggesting some kind of selection factor in the hiring procedures.

Table 3

1972-73 School Year Grades (on a 4 point scale)

	Mean	S.D.	
14/15 year-old Experimentals	2.41	0.68	(N=47)
16/18 year-old Controls	2.14	0.57	(N=38)
14/15 year-old Controls	1.91	0.83	(N=45)

A group-by-group, year-by-year grade comparison indicates that there are no significant changes in grade point average (GPA) for any of the groups, although there was a tendency for the 14/15 year-old control group and the 16/18 year-old control group to go down in GPA, while the 14/15 year-old experimentalgroup has an almost identical GPA for the two years.

Comparison of the 1972-1973 GPAs yields a similar significant difference between groups ($p < .005$). The major contribution to this difference, with 14/15 year-old experimental subjects getting better

*The phrase "level of significance" refers to the number of times an event may happen by chance. This can be differentiated from the occurrence of an event which is not due to chance. Chance events are not true differences, and appropriate statistical analysis therefore undertakes to evaluate the chance factor. This is statistically expressed by "probability" (p). A statistical probability statement $p < .05$ is an indication, for example, that this is a chance event at the level of five times out of a hundred. Therefore findings with a p level of .05 or less are usually interpreted as true differences, or at a very low level of chance occurrence. As the probability (p) level increases, so does the chance factor. In interpreting the statistical level of "true difference" findings in the present study, the maximum chance level set for consideration was $p < .10$. Differences greater than $p < .10$ were interpreted as chance events.

grades, rests in the comparison of the two 14/15 year-old groups ($p < .003$).

Table 4

Grade Point Averages for Remainers and Leavers for Two School Years of Two NYC Groups

		1971-1972 GPA	1972-1973 GPA
14/15 year-old experimental remainers (N=36)	Mean	2.54	2.44
	S.D.	0.60	0.66
14/15 year-old experimental leavers (N=11)	Mean	1.92	2.31
	S.D.	1.01	0.78
16/18 year-old control remainers (N=31)	Mean	2.39	2.14
	S.D.	0.80	0.58
16/18 year-old control leavers (N=7)	Mean	1.60	2.14
	S.D.	0.59	0.61

Appropriate tests of significance clearly indicate that the remainers in both NYC groups achieved a significantly higher GPA than the leavers in the academic year prior to the project ($p < .01$ for 14/15 year-olds; $p < .02$ for 16/18 year-olds). Furthermore, there were no statistical differences found in the year-end GPA comparisons of remainers and leavers following Phase I of the project in May, 1973. The changes which caused this finding were a borderline significant increase in grades ($p < .09$) in the 14/15 year-old leavers between the two year-end GPAs and a more significant decrease in grades ($p < .06$) in the 16/18 year-old controls group for the same time span.

Possible explanations for these findings may be as follows:

1. For the 14/15 year-old leavers it appears (in light of the large spread of scores for both GPA time samples) that the leaver group may be composed, in part, of "pushouts"; that is, subjects who may be good academic achievers but who were released from the program as a result of such factors as ineligibility for family financial reasons. This proved to be the case, as the 1972-73 GPAs for leavers who left the program because of "economic ineligibility" was 2.27 (N=4).

In contrast, those who were dropped for all other reasons achieved a GPA of 1.71 (N=7). This difference was statistically significant ($p < .06$). No other comparisons of leavers reasons yielded significant GPA differences.

2. The significant increase in final GPAs from one academic year to the next in the 16/18 year-old leavers could not be explained on the basis of voluntary-non-voluntary withdrawal.

School Absence

Data on school absence of the subjects were obtained from the records of each school.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.) of Numbers of Reported School Day Absences for Base School Year (1971-72) and Test Year (1972-73) Reported by Groups and Leavers vs. Remainer Categories

	1971-72 School Year		1972-73 School Year	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Experimentals (N=47)	4.92	5.38	13.55	11.60
16/18 year-old Controls (N=38)	6.13	7.95	12.53	11.80
14/15 year-old Controls (N=45)	7.58	5.33	17.04	11.97
Experimental Remainers (N=36)	4.69	5.47	13.83	12.53
Experimental Leavers (N=11)	5.64	5.24	12.64	8.26
16/18 year old Control Remainers (N=31)	5.68	7.20	13.26	12.51
16/18 year-old Control Leavers (N=7)	8.14	11.16	9.28	7.80

Statistical analysis revealed no significant differences between the three groups for either the base year or the test year. However, all three groups' absolute number of absences increased significantly ($p < .01$ or better) from the first to the second year.

The same pattern of significant increase in "days absent" from the first to second year in this comparison was found for experimental remainers and leavers as well as 16/18 year-old control remainers. No significant difference was found between 16/18 year-old leavers in comparison of the two school years under consideration. Furthermore, no statistical differences were found between these two groups in comparison of leavers and remainers for both years. One possible explanation for the non-significant difference in first year-second year comparison of 16/18 year-old leavers may well be their high first year absenteeism.

The factors which made for a significant increase within the various groups for the time period involved were, of course, beyond the control of the project, but the following contributing factors can be suggested. Average attendance (Appendix D) for school children in the schools and grades from which the subjects of this study were chosen, showed a general decrease from the base year to the test year. The specific reasons for the decrease may well be related to busing, which caused a cautionary attitude by many parents resulting in keeping children home at the beginning of the school busing regardless of whether or not their children were bused. Furthermore, the busing transportation system did not work adequately for several weeks at the beginning and thus some of the subjects in the study never got to school even when they wanted to attend.

School Tardiness

Similar to the absence data, tardiness data were obtained from the records of the subjects in each individual school.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.) of Number of Reported School Tardiness for Base Year (1971-72) and Test Year (1972-73) Reported by Groups and Remainer vs. Leaver Categories

	1971-72 School Year Mean	S.D.	1972-73 School Year Mean	S.D.
Experimentals (N=47)	3.06	3.68	10.57	10.24
16/18 year-old Controls (N=38)	4.05	7.25	5.53	5.23
14/15 year-old Controls (N=45)	3.73	5.31	7.56	8.39
Experimental Remainers (N=36)	2.81	3.82	8.61	8.23
Experimental Leavers (N=11)	3.91	3.21	16.09	14.24
16/18 year-old Control Remainers (N=31)	4.54	7.91	5.87	5.34
16/18 year-old Control Leavers (N=7)	1.86	2.41	4.00	4.72

The comparison data on tardiness are very similar to the absence data. Of the 13 comparisons run for each table, 9 comparisons showed similarities in statistical patterns. The 4 comparisons ($p<.05$ or better) which were dissimilar were as follows:

1. The 16/18 year-old controls did not increase significantly in tardiness from the first year to the second, while they did on absence.
2. The experimentals were significantly tardier than the other two groups for the 1972-73 school year, while there was no such difference in number of absences.
3. Experimental leavers were significantly more tardy in the test year than remainers, although they were not different on the absence comparison for the same year.

4. While showing significantly more absences during the test year, 16/18 year-old control remainers manifested no such differences in tardiness.

While the experimentals tardiness increased, and the older control group did so minimally, no significant patterns seem to have emerged. Increase in tardiness occurred for all the subjects in the test year. The same reasons for these changes may be forwarded as were advanced for the absence findings.

Juvenile Court Data

Juvenile Court contacts declined in all three groups in the test year. While 17 of the subjects were known to the Juvenile Court in their total lives previous to the fall of 1972 (only contacts for criminality were utilized; dependency and neglect were not included), only 5 had crime-related contacts during the school year 1972-73. Of these, 2 were experimentals (shoplifting, disorderly conduct) 1 was in the younger control group (habitual disobedience), and 2 were in the older control group (1 shoplifting, and 1 had 2 violations for shoplifting and violation of aftercare).

Of the 5 who were known to Juvenile Court in 1972-73, only 1 was previously known. She was the multiple-violation member of the older control group.

The above comparison, indicating 17 contacts diminishing to 5, compares school year 1972-73 with all previous violations. However, when the comparison is made between 1972-73 and 1971-72 only, the figures change somewhat. In this comparison 8 contacts occurred in 1971-72 in comparison with 5 in 1972-73. Of the 8 contacts in 1971-72, 2 were experimentals, five were younger controls, and 1 was a 16/18 year-old control. The 5 contacts in 1972-73 included 2 experimentals, 1 14/15 year-old control, and 2 16/18 year-old controls.

It is the conclusion of the research team that the Juvenile Court data are not a conclusive indicator in this study because of the small number of occurrences.

Reported Pregnancy

Twelve pregnancies occurred within the entire test population during the project period. Five of these were in the older control group, four in the younger control group, and three among experimentals. It is obvious that the number is smaller among the experimentals than either of the other two groups, but comparison with national and local rates of illegitimacy is difficult.

The Memphis and Shelby County Health Department figures on illegitimacy refer, of course, to reported illegitimate births only, which is expressed as 23.8% for the total population in 1970. Extrapolation of related data seems to place the illegitimacy base rate for black 14/15 year-olds in Shelby County at between 5 and 6%. Further, their reported figures are for 1972, while population figures are based on the 1970 census in the affected age groups. In addition, these figures are for reported illegitimate births, and no reliable data are available on unreported births, abortions, or natural terminations.

In "Years for Decision," by Parnes, Shea, et. al., published as Manpower Research Monograph No. 24, in 1971, the national illegitimacy rate among 14/15 year old black girls is indicated as 3%, and the rate among 16/17 year olds is indicated as 10%. The difference between these two rates is of particular concern in this study, since all but one of the experimentals, and the younger control group members who became pregnant became 16 during 1973.

The percentile rates of reported pregnancy among the three groups can be stated as 6% among the experimentals, 8% among the younger control group and 10% among the older control group members.

Dealing with the reported pregnancies in terms of their absolute number, little discrimination emerges among the three groups. The research team therefore feels that the rate of pregnancy is not a significant indicator for the purposes of this study. The possibility is suggested that approaches designed to minimize pregnancy must be begun at earlier ages.

Work Supervisor Ratings

The Freeburg-Reilly (Freeburg, 1971) consists of two 10-item rating scales, one for males and one for females. Only the scale for females was used in this study. The items deal with on-the-job behavior, and are used by the work supervisors who have most knowledge of the subjects. Each item (e.g. "wastes time on the job") has five options. For evaluation, these range from "this describes just how the enrollee is" to "the enrollee is not like this at all." Each item is scored from 1 to 5. A low score indicates good job performance evaluation and vice versa. The minimum-maximum score range is thus from 10 to 50.

In the development of this technique, Freeburg and Reilly found that this measure was significantly and positively related to their counselor rating scale and number of jobs chosen from a job list. It was found to relate significantly in a negative fashion to the amount of trouble the subject had with the police and the number of work site absences.

The Freeburg-Reilly scale used in this study was administered for all NYC subjects at two junctures (see Appendix E), the first within 10 days of the beginning of the project. It was again used one week before the end of the first phase of the project, in May, 1973. Furthermore, the 14/15 year-old experimental group was additionally rated during the first and last weeks respectively of the 9-week summer portion of the project as well as in early April, 1973. The experimental group, therefore, was evaluated five times.

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.) on the Freeburg-Reilly Work Supervisor's Rating Scale on the Two NYC Groups

		Testing 1	Testing 2	Testing 3	Testing 4	Testing 5
14/15 year-old Experimentals	Mean	17.34	16.56	18.00	21.05	19.15
	S.D.	4.98	6.86	6.87	7.98	6.56
		(N=50)	(N=50)	(N=38)	(N=38)	(N=38)
16/18 year-old Control Group	Mean	14.69		15.89		
	S.D.	8.56		11.35		
		(N=45)		(N=37)		

As might be expected, the older group received more positive work supervisor ratings ($p < .06$) than the experimental group at the outset (first 10 days) of the project. Several factors must be considered in understanding this finding. First of all, this was the first systematic work experience for most (if not all) of the 14/15 year-old experimental group, while a large number of the 16/18 year-old group had at least one year of NYC work experience. Furthermore, it can be expected that the older NYC group had developed appropriate work habits for NYC settings. Lastly, the 16/18 year-old group were, on the average, two years older, and as such had matured generally and specifically in defining, clarifying and beginning to implement future plans as measured by the Ezekiel technique (see Table 13).

The only other meaningful comparison which yielded a significant statistical difference ($p < .03$) was a poorer work supervisor evaluation for the summer experimentals between early May and late June ratings. Aside from the fact that there was about a four week non-work period between Phase I and Phase 2 of the project, there were both job-site and work supervisor changes, which could account for the rating differences.

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations (S.D.) for Remainers and Leavers on the Freeburg-Reilly Work Supervisors Evaluation of all Experimentals at the Beginning of Phase I of the Project. (November, 1972)

		Remainers	Leavers
14/15 year-old Experimentals	Mean	17.11	18.08
	S.D.	4.67	6.03
		(N=38)	(N=12)
16/18 year-old Control Group	Mean	14.16	17.12
	S.D.	8.69	8.00
		(N=37)	(N=8)

The only significant difference ($p < .07$) on this particular analysis shows that the ultimate remainers show better work evaluation at the beginning of the project than the younger 14/15 year-old remainers do. This might be expected because of age differences, NYC work experience, and age-related clarity of goal differences. Nevertheless, it is worthy of note that the initial work supervisors' ratings of the

14/15 year-old NYC remainers is almost identical with similar ratings of the older NYC group leavers. Furthermore, the large variance of scores among both groups of leavers suggests that there were some subjects who left the program despite very good work supervisors' evaluations.

VII. Test Data from Study Population

A number of psychological measures were obtained up to three different times. The following chart indicates when the various instruments were administered.

Instrument	November 11, 1972	May 12, 1973	August 4, 1973
Jr.-Sr. High School Personality Quest. (HSPQ form A)	x	x	x
Ezekiel Fictional Autcbiography	x		
Bialer Locus of Control Scale	x	x	x
Srole Anomie Scale	x	x	x
McClosky & Schaar Anomie Scale	x	x	x
Middleton Anomie Scale	x	x	x
Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale		x	x
Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale	x	x	x
Stinchcombe Student Attitude Scale	x		
S.S.D.S.Questionnaire		x	x (partial)
Baughman and Dahlstrom Interview Schedules*	x		

*The interviews were, of course, conducted over a period of weeks at the beginning of the project period.

The tests were administered on the Saturday mornings which fell within one week of the beginning or end of the project periods. The administrators were experienced black female local school counselors, who were briefed by the research staff prior to testing. All the subjects were paid $10 for each testing session, which lasted several hours. The procedure took place on the job sites of the 14/15 year-old experimentals. Whenever necessary, transportation to the testing sites was provided by the research staff.

Table 9

Number of Test Participants

	14/15 year-old Experimentals	16/18 year-old Controls	14/15 year-old Controls
Administration 1	50	45	51
Administration 2	50	45	51
Administration 3	49		51

The retention rate for the two retesting sessions was extremely high, particularly as a considerable number of older control subjects (16) were graduating from high school around the time of the second testing session in May. It may be hypothesized that the high number of testing participants in all groups, including the leavers from both NYC groups, was probably due to the monetary rewards as well as written and phone call reminders.

In order to maintain a high test participation, it was also necessary to schedule makeup tests for some of the subjects. This was usually done within one week of the scheduled testing session. The project was fortunate in having available appropriate follow-up techniques for the achievement of this extremely high participation rate.

Description of the Tests

Jr.-Sr. High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ)

The Jr.-Sr. High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ), a 142 item test for 12-18 year-olds, is a well-standardized and established technique which attempts to provide "... maximum information in the

shortest time about the greatest number of dimensions of personality" (Cattell, 1969), and has established reliability and validity. This test was used in each of the three assessment sessions, and takes approximately 40-50 minutes administration time. It has several alternate forms, of which Form A was used in this study.

The test itself is made up of 14 so-called "source traits," and an additional number of so-called "secondary traits." The present analysis deals only with the source traits.

Each of the traits has two basic polarities, which may be described as follows:

Factor A: Reserved, detached, critical, aloof, stiff - versus - warm-hearted, out-going, easy-going, participating.

Factor B: Low mental capacity, inability to handle abstract problems - versus - high general mental ability, insight, fast learning, intellectual adaptability.

Factor C: Emotionally unstable, easily upset, changeable - versus - emotionally stable, mature, reality-oriented, calm.

Factor D: Undemonstrative, deliberate, inactive, stodgy - versus - excitable, impatient, demanding, over-active, unrestrained.

Factor E: Obedient, mild, easily led, docile, accommodating - versus - assertive, aggressive, competitive, stubborn.

Factor F: Sober, taciturn, serious - versus - enthusiastic, heedless, happy-go-lucky.

Factor G: Disregards rules, expedient - versus - conscientious, persistent, moralistic, staid.

Factor H: Shy, timid, restrained, sensitive to threat - versus adventurous, thick-skinned, socially bold.

Factor I: Tough-minded, rejecting illusions - versus - tender-minded, sensitive, dependent, over-protective.

Factor J: Zestful, liking group action - versus - circumspect, individualistic, reflective, internally restrained.

Factor O: Self-assured, placid, secure, complacent, serene - versus - apprehensive, self-reproaching, insecure, troubled.

Factor Q_2: Socially group-dependent, joiner, sound follower - versus - self-sufficient, resourceful, preferring own decisions.

Factor Q_3: Uncontrolled, lax, following own urges, careless of social rules - versus - controlled, exacting, socially precise, compulsive, and following his self-image.

Factor Q_4: Relaxed, tranquil, torpid, unfrustrated, composed - versus - tense, frustrated, driven, overwrought, fretful.

The instrument is readily available to qualified professionals.

Ezekiel Fictional Autobiography

The Ezekiel Fictional Autobiography of the Personal Future method (Ezekiel, 1968) is a task in which the subjects are asked to imagine and describe their lives at two future times - in 5 years from now and at age 30, respectively. This technique, used with Peace Corps volunteers, was found to relate very significantly to a number of overseas performance criteria. The mock autobiography is intended to assess:

1. The degree to which the individual is mapping her future;
2. The degree to which the subject has an understanding of essential effortful strivings necessary for the attainment of projected goals;
3. The degree to which the individual sees herself as the agency of decision making in her life.

The instrument used appears in Appendix E.

The analysis consisted of 5 measures (Ezekiel, Document 9736). Two of these were measures of "differentiation," focusing on the degree of detailed development of the respondent's projected future. The third measure - "demand characteristic" - is a manifestation of the intensity of effort the respondent demands of herself and may thus be seen as an indication of committment. The fourth dimension is an assessment of "agency," that is, the degree to which the respondent sees herself as principal decision maker and thus the degree to which she is ready to take responsibility for charting her own future course. The last measure, "task rejection," evaluates the degree to which the respondent refuses to cooperate in following the instructions of the test itself. The first four scales are rated on a 1 - 7 basis, with 7 indicating a high presence of the dimension. The task rejection is rated on a 1 - 4 basis, with higher scores indicating greater rejection.

This technique was only used once in the present study, as early as data analysis revealed that the spread of scores on all dimensions did not appear to be large, and that the conceptual level of the task may have been too difficult for the respondents. In this connection it should be remembered that Peace Corps Volunteers were the original subjects in the utilization of this approach. Nevertheless, a reworking of this assessment technique still appears to have potential value for predicting socially-defined success for NYC participants.

Bialer Locus of Control Scale

The modified Bialer Children's Locus of Control Scale (Bialer, 1961; Gochman, 1971) is an 11-item test which is answered with "yes" or "no". This scale is designed to measure the extent to which a given child generally construes both negative and positive events as being a consequence of his/her own action (i.e. internally controlled), rather than being due to the whims of fate, chance, luck, or other people (i.e. externally controlled). The notion is an outgrowth of an internal-versus-external control of reinforcement construct developed as part of the social learning theory outlined by Rotter (Rotter, 1954 - 1966).

The original Bialer Scale consists of 23 items. However, Gochman (Gochman, 1971) shortened the form to 11 items as the other 12 items were not found to be adequately reliable. This shortened scale form was used in all three testing sessions. A measured internal locus of control is manifested in higher scores. The instrument used appears in Appendix E.

Srole Anomie Scale

Seeman (Seeman, 1972) suggests that alienation may be categorized into six forms: 1) powerlessness, 2) meaninglessness, 3) normlessness, 4) value isolation (cultural estrangement), 5) self-estrangement and 6) social isolation. Srole's Anomie Scale (Srole, 1956) is a well-established 5-item "agree" or "disagree"scale (see Appendix E).

According to Srole, this scale measures"interpersonal alienation," perhaps closest to Seeman's "social isolation" category. However, Seeman suggests that inasmuch as aspects of trust, powerlessness and despair are also tapped in the scale, the scale is probably a better (though by no means a distinct) measure of the "normlessness" dimension of anomie. "Normlessness" may be defined as a sense of high expectancy that socially unapproved means are necessary to achieve given goals. It is Seeman's view that a person is not bound by conventional standards in pursuing conventional goals (i.e. wealth, status).

McClosky and Schaar Anomie Scale

McClosky and Schaar's measure of anomie (McClosky, 1965) is a 9-item scale in which the respondent "agrees" or"disagrees" with the statement. The items appear to have been especially developed to measure the "normlessness" dimension of anomie. The authors suggest "deregulation" as another word for "normlessness". The instrument used appears in Appendix E.

Middleton Anomie Scale

Middleton's six item "agree"or "disagree" scale (Middleton, 1963) is unique in that each item attempts to measure one of the six varieties of alienation mentioned above. However, statistical analysis suggests that the scale's "cultural estrangement" dimension item may not be as strong as the others.

The instrument used appears in Appendix E.

Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale

The Nowicki-Strickland "Locus of Control Scale for Children" (Nowicki 1973) is a recently-developed 40-item scale (see Appendix E) answered "yes" or "no." The reason for inclusion of this scale, based on the previously-stated notions of Rotten, is that this appears to be the best developed measurement tool for the "internal-external" locus of control dimension, with adequate reliability, validity and norms appropriate for the study population.

The instrument used appears in Appendix E.

Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale

The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (Piers, 1969) is still largely in the developmental stage, although a search of the literature does not yield a better assessment technique in this area for the population of subjects in this study. The scale, made up of 80 "yes" or "no" items, has a normative sample mean of 51.84 and a standard deviation of 13.87. It purports to measure self-attitudes and their correlates. Although some research has been done on breaking this scale down into clusters (i.e. behavior, intellectual and school status, physical appearance and attributes, anxiety, popularity and happiness-satisfaction), the information from these clusters is so far only tentative and not reported in this study. The instrument is readily available to qualified professionals.

Stinchcombe Student Attitude Scale

This questionnaire (Stinchcombe, 1964) deals with demographic, attitudinal, and general academic information secured from subjects from all three groups, about themselves. The questionnaire was administered only at the beginning of the research, and was replaced with the "Project Questionnaire" which was administered in May and again administered at the end of the project in modified form. The Stinchcombe instrument appears in Appendix E.

S.S.D.S. Questionnaire

The research staff developed the SSDS Questionnaire for the second testing on the basis of the findings on the pre-test Stinchcombe data

as well as search of the literature and information provided by various research personnel. This instrument covered areas of respondents' attitudes towards family, perceived family attitudes toward respondents, aspirations in school, expectations for future schooling and work, etc.

Following the first administration of the S.S.D.S. Questionnaire, the instrument was modified and shortened as the result of evaluation of the instrument. Both forms of this instrument appear in Appendix E.

Baughman and Dahlstrom Interview Schedules

The interview used with the experimentals, controls and parents was a modification of the Baughman and Dahlstrom scales used in their study entitled "Negro and White Children " (Baughman, 1968). The research design included these interviews not only to secure a personal direct response from a sample of the subject population, but also to establish a general feeling for the nature of current and future research in this area. The interview was conducted by research staff. A random sample of 8 subjects each from each of the three groups was used, for a total of 24 interviews.

In-depth interviews were also conducted with a random sample of 8 parents from each of the 3 groups, for a total of 24 interviews. It should be noted that the interviews with parents had 2 major characteristics: first, the interviews were conducted exclusively with mothers, and second, the parents selected from each group were the respective mothers of the 24 subjects who were interviewed. The interview schedules appear in Appendix E.

Findings of the Tests

Jr.-Sr. High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ Form A)

The data from this test is reported by means of discriminant analysis statistical techniques.* This method is utilized for analyzing differences between groups when the factor or dimensions of the instrument are correlated, as is the case with this test (Tatsuoka, 1970).

The means for each group on each factor are presented in Sten scores. A Sten is the raw score mean reported as the mid-point of each of ten units of the range of standard deviations. Thus the range of reported Sten scores is from one to ten, with one and ten representing the extreme poles of the range.

Table 10

Sten Scores for Fourteen HSPQ (Form A) Variables for Three Groups on First Testing

	14/15 year-old Experimentals (N=44**)	16/18 year-old Controls (N=37)	14/15 year-old Controls (N=51)
Factor A	5.98	5.65	5.96
Factor B	3.73	4.54	3.88
Factor C	7.18	6.41	6.80
Factor D	5.27	5.14	5.61
Factor E	5.84	5.92	5.00
Factor F	3.68	3.19	3.84
Factor G	6.08	6.03	6.58
Factor H	6.59	5.65	6.12
Factor I	5.14	5.16	5.18
Factor J	5.05	6.51	6.04
Factor O	4.14	5.08	4.90
Factor Q_2	6.43	6.73	6.77
Factor Q_3	7.23	6.87	6.92
Factor Q_4	4.41	5.16	5.04

*The data was analyzed by Dr. Herbert W. Eber, Psychological Resources Associates, who has worked intimately with Dr. R.B.Cattell, the developer of this test.

**The modified number of cases reflects the removal of leavers prior to April 1, 1973 for this analysis

Of the above fourteen factors, the following five yielded significant differences between the three groups ($p < .02$ or better) on the initial testing: Factors B, D, G, J, O.

On Factor B, which is basically a brief measure of intelligence,* the older control group is significantly brighter than the two younger groups. The means of estimated intelligence levels for the groups are as follows: the experimental group = 86; 14/15 year-old controls = 87; and the older controls = 92.

On Factor D, which measures the dimension phlegmatic temperament vs. excitability, the 16/18 year-old control group was found to be least excitable while the 14/15 year-old controls were most excitable, with the experimental group being much closer to the older group than their own age group controls. The means of the three groups were in the average range for this variable.

Factor G measures the strength of vs. lack of acceptance of group moral standards or superego strength. On this dimension the 14/15 year-old controls show significantly more acceptance of standards as manifested in superego strengths, e.g. conscientiousness. It is worth noting that the means of each group is above average on this variable.

Factor J measures the degree to which the individual is group-oriented or prefers to do things in her own fastidious manner. The pre-test findings indicate that the 14/15 year old experimental girls are significantly more zestful and group-action oriented, below the mean on this variable. The 16/18 year-old control group scores highest in the opposite direction, thus being much more interpersonally isolated, guarded and individualistic.

Factor O assesses the dimension of untroubled adequacy vs. insecure apprehensiveness and guilt proneness. The experimental group

*Intelligence measures should be qualified by considering the norms for the population being tested. In this framework, the findings indicate that all 3 groups test at the mean or better in comparison to normative data on black female adolescents.

manifest a clear difference from the other two groups, being much more self-assured, secure and adequate. All of the means of the 3 groups are in the low average range (towards untroubled adequacy) on this variable.

Table 11

Sten Scores for Fourteen HSPQ (Form A) Variables for Three Groups on Second Testing

	14/15 year-old Experimentals (N=44)*	16/18 year-old Controls (N=37)	14/15 year-old Controls (N=51)
Factor A	5.96	5.89	5.87
Factor B	4.13	4.97	3.83
Factor C	6.91	6.43	6.82
Factor D	5.33	5.49	5.38
Factor E	6.45	5.76	5.82
Factor F	4.70	3.64	4.19
Factor G	5.74	5.87	5.92
Factor H	6.16	5.81	6.12
Factor I	4.26	4.87	5.11
Factor J	6.02	6.46	5.77
Factor O	4.03	4.36	4.67
Factor Q_2	6.37	6.44	6.64
Factor Q_3	6.67	6.95	6.36
Factor Q_4	4.72	5.37	4.97

All data were analyzed to ascertain changes between the two testing sessions November 1972 and May 1973). Changes were found for factors B, D, F, G, I, J and Q_4 at the $p < .10$ level of significance. Although this criterion is generally considered not to be stringent enough for clear statistical significance, it does, however, show some directional effects.

Factor B: the experimentals and older controls appear to manifest a

*The modified number of cases reflects the removal of leavers prior to April 1, 1973 for this analysis.

higher level of intelligence on this testing, while the 14/15 year-old control group does not. This means that the mean IQ of experimentals and older controls went up about 3 points, while this measure did not change in the 14/15 year-old controls.

Factor D: the change here is in the 16/18 year-old control group who score more highly on "excitability" than they did on the pre-testing. Thus, this group yields scores of greater impulsivity, whereas the younger groups do not. The means of all three groups are in the average range.

Factor F: although all groups move somewhat toward greater enthusiasm and light-heartedness, the crucial change is in the 14/15 year-old experimental group, which shows significant changes on this factor at the second testing compared to the first.

Factor G: although all groups seem to manifest less conscientiousness in the second testing session, the biggest change is noted in the 14/15 year-old controls. However, some of these changes may be expected on the basis of normal re-test effect towards greater honesty in responding to the test items. This is substantiated by the fact that all three group means moved more toward the average range on this variable.

Factor I: while the two control groups change a little in the same direction, the crucial change is noted in the 14/15 year-old experimental subjects. These youngsters become more unsentimental, self-reliant, practical, mature, realistic and group-solidarity-oriented. Whereas the first testing found all three groups near the mean, the second testing yields a marked movement towards this "tough-minded" pole by the 14/15 year-old experimental group.

Factor J: here again, the change is in the 14/15 year-old experimental group, while the other two groups change little by comparison. Whereas the 14/15 year-old experimental group was significantly more group-action oriented, less fastidious and preferred to keep in the background, etc., at the start of the project, this is no longer true in May. They score between the two control groups at the second testing session, and thus are found to have changed toward more

circumspect individualism, reflectiveness and internal restraint. All three groups score above the mean, toward the circumspect individualistic end of the dimension.

Factor Q_4: it appears that the experimentals and older controls become more tense, frustrated, fretful, etc. during Phase I, while the 14/15 year-old control group changes little. Although all three groups were below the mean of the norms at the time of the pre-test, the experimentals and older controls move closer to the mean, while the 14/15 year-old controls become slightly less tense.

Table 12

Sten Scores for Fourteen HSPQ Test (Form A)
Variables for Two 14/15 year-old Groups on Third Testing

	14/15 year-old Experimentals (N=43)*	14/15 year-old Controls (N=47)
Factor A	6.14	6.02
Factor B	4.00	4.04
Factor C	6.84	6.60
Factor D	5.19	5.64
Factor E	6.49	6.02
Factor F	5.02	5.04
Factor G	5.40	5.98
Factor H	6.49	6.30
Factor I	3.84	4.75
Factor J	6.09	5.83
Factor O	4.35	4.92
Factor Q_2:	6.51	6.79
Factor Q_3:	6.47	5.68
Factor Q_4:	4.84	4.85

Factors G, I, O and Q_3 are found to differentiate these two groups at third testing, at the 10% level of significance ($p < .10$). It should again be noted that this level of significance is only suggestive and directional, rather than meeting the usual rigid statistical criteria of significance.

*The modified number of cases reflects the removal of leavers prior to April 1, 1973 for this analysis.

On both Factors G (conscientiousness vs. low super-ego strength) and O (untroubled adequacy vs. guilt proneness), the younger experimentals manifest somewhat different mean scores than the 14/15 year-old controls. The experimentals seem less accepting of group moral standards and more self-assured and secure than the 14/15 year-old controls. These relative differences are similar to the pre-test findings, although the differences between the two groups were much greater at that time. Although little change is noted from first to third testing on Factor G for each group, both groups appear to have moved toward more complacency, self-assurance and security (untroubled adequacy).

On Factor I (tough vs. tender-mindedness), whereas there were no differences between the two 14/15 year-old groups at the outset of Phase I, the second testing indicates that the 14/15 year-old experimentals had become somewhat more tough-minded, and they continue this trend in the third test.

On Factor Q_3 (low self-sentiment integration vs. high strength of self-sentiment), the experimental group shows a tendency toward following their self-image, greater will power, self-control, etc. (higher self-sentiment) than the 14/15 year-old controls.

A comparison of changes in the two 14/15 year-old groups on the 14 HSPQ (Form A) Factors between testings 1 and 2, as well as between testings 2 and 3, yields no significant changes. Furthermore, a comparison of remainers and leavers for experimentals and older controls reveals no initial differences on this test.

Initial differences between the two 14/15 year-old groups on Factor J disappear at the final testing, while differences on Factors G and O become less significant. At the same time, new differences appear at the final testing on Factors I and Q_3. The initial differences on Factors B and D are attributable to the older controls. The experimental group becomes more zestful, prefers group action, invests their personalities in group activities, accepts common standards, likes more attention, etc. (Factor J), while the 14/15 year-old controls do not change. This kind of change could obviously be a result of the peer group experience. Although felt to be heavily

constitutional, this factor relates to extroversion-introversion and has been found to be affected by therapeutic-like intervention.

Both Factor G and O are heavily loaded for environmental influences and may be expected to change if external and immediate influences are present. Actually, neither 14/15 year-old group changes very much on Factor O (untroubled adequacy vs. guilt proneness), but the little change which did take place in the experimentals indicated some movement toward the guilt-proneness end (e.g. apprehensive, insecure, worried) of the variable. Both groups went toward the lower super-ego strength pole of Factor G, with the differences tending to disappear somewhat and the experimental group toward the lower super-ego strength end of the variable at both times.

On the tough-tender minded variable (Factor I), while there are no differences between the two younger groups at the outset, it is found that both groups become more tough-minded at the end of Phase II, but the experimentals show the more dramatic changes. Both groups started out in the average range of this dimension but the experimentals are found to be much below the average at the second testing. Thus the experimental group becomes less sentimental and more self-reliant, as well as being able to keep to the point more and becoming "tougher".

Both of these Factors (I, Q_3) are heavily environmentally produced. Factor I is a manifestation of the socialization processes of early childhood and represents traditional feminine values. Thus the experimentals seem to have moved in the direction away from traditional feminine roles.The possibility of the leader presenting this role model may be forwarded here.

Both younger groups drop in the area of self-discipline (Factor Q_3) which is heavily environmental and apparently difficult to change. The 14/15 year-old control group drops more than the 14/15 year-old experimentals from an original level which indicated no difference on this variable.

The experimentals had the opportunity in the NYC program to practice the kind of behavior measured on this test, i.e. the acceptance of assignments, utilization of some self-discipline, planning, and implementing the work program and getting feedback. It may well be that the NYC experience accounted for this difference between the two groups at the end of this project, as this disparity did not exist at the outset.

Ezekiel Fictional Autobiography

The findings for the Ezekiel Fictional Autobiographies of the Personal Future are to be found in the following table.

Table 13

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.) on Five Measures of the Ezekiel Fictional Autobiographies of the Personal Future for each Group at the Initial Testing Point

		Differentiation 1 (5 years)	Differentiation 2 (at age 30)	Demand Characteristics	Agency	Task Rejection
14/15 year-old Experimentals Group (N=50)	Mean	3.00	2.76	2.98	2.92	2.60
	S.D.	1.31	1.33	1.24	1.21	0.67
16/18 year-old Control Group (N=45)	Mean	3.48	3.29	3.23	3.15	2.71
	S.D.	1.73	1.58	1.29	1.18	0.68
14/15 year-old Controls (N=51)	Mean	2.65	2.53	2.63	2.59	2.29
	S.D.	2.03	1.21	1.26	1.18	0.58
Experimental Remainers (N=38)	Mean	3.18	2.97	3.00	2.92	2.66
	S.D.	1.27	1.41	1.27	1.24	0.71
Experimental Leavers (N=12)	Mean	2.4[illegible]	2.08	2.92	2.92	2.42
	S.D.	1.31	0.79	1.16	1.17	0.51
16/18 year-old Control Remainers (N=37)	Mean	3.65	3.46	3.35	3.32	2.78
	S.D.	1.78	1.63	1.34	1.23	0.71
16/18 year-old Control Leavers (N=8)	Mean	2.88	2.63	2.50	2.38	2.50
	S.D.	1.64	1.30	0.93	0.74	0.53

Tests of significance comparing the two 14/15 year-old groups yield no significant differences except for "task rejection." Here, the 14/15 year-old control group was found to reject the task more significantly ($p < .05$). In other analyses, it was found that the older controls scored significantly higher than either of the 14/15 year-old groups on both"differentiation" scales, and also rejected the task less than the 14/15 year-old control group. The higher "differentiation" scores for the older group thus indicate that they had developed a more complex, detailed picture of their own futures. This might be anticipated, largely on the basis of age differences.

One of the task rejection findings is perhaps more difficult to understand. The lower task rejection by the 16/18 year-old controls may well be related to the clearer picture that they have of their own future. However, the higher task rejection by the 14/15 year-old controls compared to the experimental group cannot be explained on this same basis. It may well be that some selection factor for group assignment (NYC vs. non-NYC of 14/15 year-olds) may have played a role here, despite the purported randomness of assignment to groups.

Although the older control group has a significantly clearer perception of their own future goals, they do not have a similarly significant better committment toward this goal, nor do they manifest any better readiness to take responsibility for charting the appropriate future course.

With the exception of Havighurst (Havighurst, 1953) and Gottlieb and Ramsay (Gottlieb, 1964) very little work appears in the literature concerning the process and the developmental aspects of school-career choice-making in adolescents, despite the common acknowledgement of the existence of "identity crisis" for persons in this age period. The schema developed for understanding this process was based on data gathered from middle or upper income adolescents and their families, although Gottlieb and Ramsay feel that the theoretical framework is applicable to lower income groups and both sexes through age 18.

The stages of the occupational choice process as forwarded by Gottlieb and Ramsay were, of course, not directly tested or testable by means of the Ezekiel techniques. The Gottlieb and Ramsay stages range from pre-adolescence to early adulthood and are as follows:

1. Fantasy
2. Tentative Choice
    a. Interest - up to age 13
    b. Capacity state- age 13/14
    c. Value state- age 15/16
    d. Transitional stage - age 17
3. Realistic choice - age 18 plus
    a. Exploration
    b. Crystallization.

The nature of the Ezekiel Fictional Autobiography data does, however, suggest that the older remainer group is farther along in the occupational choice-making process. This might be expected since they can anticipate their intermediate and far-off futures more adequately than the 16/17 year-old leavers and both 14/15 year-old groups. Similarly the 14/15 year-old remainers are farther along in this occupational choice-making process than the leavers from this group, as well as farther along than the 14/15 year-old controls. Again, some evidence emerges for some kind of pre-selection factor in assigning girls to experimental or control groups. However, more crucial than this is the fact that apparently no systematic attention has been paid to the occupational choice-making process in the NYC programs. It would be extremely worthwhile to develop such a program within NYC, both as part of a selection procedure as well as a measure of effectiveness of the NYC programs. The beginnings of such a formulation are available by means of the Ezekiel data in this study and the Gottlieb-Ramsay theoretical constructs.

Bialer Locus of Control Scale

The findings in the Bialer Locus of Control Scale are presented in the following table.

Table 14

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.) on the Modified Bialer Locus of Control Scale for each Group tested at the Three Testing Periods

		Testing 1	Testing 2	Testing 3
14/15 year-old Experimentals	Mean	6.96	7.22	6.59
	S.D.	2.03	2.23	2.04
		(N=50)	(N=50)	(N=49)
16/18 year-old Controls	Mean	7.40	7.51	
	S.D.	2.01	1.70	
		(N=45)	(N=45)	
14/15 year old Controls	Mean	6.47	6.61	5.77
	S.D.	2.08	1.96	2.86
		(N=51)	(N=51)	(N=51)

Analysis of variance and other tests of significance between group means for each of the testings yielded a significant difference between the three groups at the initial testing ($p < .08$) and the May testing ($p < .07$). As a result of further significance testing, the crucial difference was found to lie between the means of the 16/18 year-old controls and the 14/15 year-old controls. Thus we may be dealing, at least in part, with an age variable, in that greater internal locus of control can be expected with age (Nowicki, 1973).

The two 14/15 year-old groups declined significantly between the second and third testings in this variable ($p < .01$ for 14/15 year-old experimentals; $p < .05$ for the 14/15 year-old controls). On the third testing the difference between the two above groups yielded a significantly higher Locus of Control score for the experimental group ($p < .03$).

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations (S.D.) of Remainers and Leavers of the 14/15 year-old and 16/18 year-old NYC Groups on the Modified Bialer Locus of Control Scale

		Remainers			Leavers		
		Test 1	Test 2	Test 3	Test 1	Test 2	Test 3
14/15 year-old Experimentals	Means	6.92	7.34	6.95	7.08	6.83	5.50
	S.D.	2.16	2.39	2.20	1.62	1.70	0.80
		(N=38)	(N=38)	(N=37)	(N=12)	(N=12)	(N=12)
16/18 year-old Controls	Means	7.46	7.60		7.12	7.25	
	S.D.	2.04	1.62		1.96	2.19	
		(N=37)	(N=37)		(N=8)	(N=8)	

The findings on this test display a dramatic drop in scores for the experimental leavers on the third testing as compared to the second testing. This group of twelve 14/15 year-old experimental leavers manifests significantly more ($p < .05$) external orientation (or lack of feelings of control over their lives) at this testing than they did 3 months previously. Similarly, a significant decrease is found ($p < .03$) in internal control orientation as compared with 37 tested remainers in the experimentals at that time. It should be noted that this third score drops in the summer for experimental leavers.

Srole Anomie Scale

The following table presents the findings on the five item Srole Anomie Scale.

Table 16

Means, Standard Deviations(S.D.) on the Srole Anomie Scale for each Group Tested at the Three Testing Pericds

		Testing 1	Testing 2	Testing 3
14/15 year-old Experimentals	Mean	3.90	3.26	3.37
	S.D.	1.06	1.40	1.50
		(N=50)	(N=50)	(N=38)
16/18 year-old Controls	Mean	3.65	3.58	
	S.D.	1.00	1.25	
		(N=45)	(N=45)	
14/15 year-old Controls	Mean	3.77	3.63	3.49
	S.D.	1.11	1.15	1.49
		(N=51)	(N=51)	(N=51)

Appropriate statistical analysis between groups and testing periods was performed. The significant finding was change toward less alienation in the 14/15 year-old experimental group. Their scores dropped significantly between testing periods one and two ($p < .003$), and periods one and three ($p < .05$).

Table 17

Means, Standard Deviations(S.D.) on the Srole Anomie Scale for Remainers and Leavers for the Two NYC Groups: Experimentals and Older Controls

		Testing 1	Testing 2	Testing 3
14/15 year-old Experimental Remainers	Mean	3.95	3.16	3.46
	S.D.	1.09	1.41	1.41
		(N=38)	(N=38)	(N=37)
14/15 year-old Experimental Leavers	Mean	3.75	3.50	1.92
	S.D.	0.97	1.38	0.51
		(N=12)	(N=12)	(N=11)
16/18 year-old Control Remainers	Mean	3.68	3.54	
	S.D.	1.06	1.28	
		(N=37)	(N=37)	
16/18 year-old Control Leavers	Mean	3.50	3.88	
	S.D.	0.76	1.25	
		(N=8)	(N=8)	

The comparison of leavers and remainers scores on Srole Anomie Scale yielded a significant drop ($p < .003$) by the 14/15 year-old experimental remainers between testing session one and two and an insignificant increase between testing period two and three. A very significant ($p < .0001$) decrease in alienation was found in the 14/15 year-old experimental leaver group in comparing the last testing session with the first two testing sessions' data. Furthermore, while the differences between 14/15 year-old experimental leavers and remainers are not significant for the first two testing sessions, they are clearly different ($p < .0009$) at the final testing period. There are no differences between or among remainers and leavers for the first two testing periods on this instrument. The findings then clearly indicate that the significance occurs for leavers between the May and August testing periods.

McClosky and Schaar Anomie Scale

The following table presents the findings on the nine item McClosky and Schaar Anomie Scale.

Table 18

Means and Standard Deviations(S.D.) on the McClosky and Schaar Anomie Scale for each Group Tested at the Three Testing Periods

		Testing 1	Testing 2	Testing 3
14/15 year-old Experimentals	Mean	6.10	5.70	5.29
	S.D.	1.53	1.98	1.84
		(N=50)	(N=50)	(N=38)
16/18 year-old Controls	Mean	5.89	5.51	
	S.D.	1.83	1.49	
		(N=45)	(N=45)	
14/15 year-old Controls	Mean	5.96	6.00	4.86
	S.D.	1.48	1.91	2.29
		(N=51)	(N=51)	(N=51)

Statistical analysis yielded a significant lowering of alienation on this scale for both 14/15 year-old groups. Both groups declined significantly between tests one and three ($p < .01$) for the experimental group and $p < .004$ for the younger controls. The 14/15 year-old controls also showed a decreased alienation score between testing sessions two and three ($p < .004$).

Table 19

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.) on the McClosky and Schaar Anomie Scale for Remainers and Leavers for the Experimental and Older Control Groups

		Testing 1	Testing 2	Testing 3
14/15 year-old Experimental Remainers	Mean	6.11	5.66	5.43
	S.D.	1.49	2.10	1.64
		(N=38)	(N=38)	(N=37)
14/15 year-old Experimental Leavers	Mean	5.75	5.83	4.00
	S.D.	2.42	1.59	1.21
		(N=12)	(N=12)	(N=11)
16/18 year-old Control Remainers	Mean	5.89	5.38	
	S.D.	1.88	1.52	
		(N=37)	(N=37)	
16/18 year-old Control Leavers	Mean	5.88	6.25	
	S.D.	1.73	1.28	
		(N=8)	(N=8)	

The findings on the McClosky and Schaar Anomie Scale are very similar to those of the Srole Scale. Again, there are no differences between remainers and leavers nor between the two testing sessions for the 16/18 year-old control group.

However, the 14/15 year-old experimental remainers showed significantly less alienation ($p < .02$) between testing sessions one and three, whereas the comparable leavers manifested more significant drop in alienation scores for a similar time period ($p < .006$). Although there are no differences between remainers and leavers at the outset of the project, the leavers show more of a drop in alienation scores ($p < .008$) than do the remainers at the final testing session.

Middleton Anomie Scale

The following table presents the findings on the 6-item Middleton Anomie Scale.

Table 20
Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.) on the Middleton Alienation Scale for each Group Tested at the Three Testing Periods

		Testing 1	Testing 2	Testing 3
14/15 year-old Experimentals	Mean	3.32	3.04	2.90
	S.D.	1.31	1.47	1.45
		(N=50)	(N=50)	(N=38)
16/18 year-old Controls	Mean	3.31	3.02	
	S.D.	1.20	1.55	
		(N=45)	(N=45)	
14/15 year-old Controls	Mean	3.33	3.41	2.88
	S.D.	1.36	1.20	1.75
		(N=51)	(N=51)	(N=51)

The only significant difference between testing periods and groups was a significant drop on this alienation scale for the 14/15 year-old controls between testing period one and three ($p < .05$).

Table 21

Means, Standard Deviations(S.D.) on the Middleton Anomie Scale for Leavers and Remainers for the Experimental and Older Control Group

		Testing 1	Testing 2	Testing 3
14/15 year-old Experimental Remainers	Mean	3.21	2.92	2.97
	S.D.	1.34	1.56	1.38
		(N=38)	(N=38)	(N=37)
14/15 year-old Experimental Leavers	Mean	3.67	3.42	2.50
	S.D.	1.23	1.08	0.80
		(N=12)	(N=12)	(N=12)
16/18 year-old Control Remainers	Mean	3.35	3.00	
	S.D.	1.23	1.58	
		(N=37)	(N=37)	
16/18 year-old Control Leavers	Mean	3.13	3.38	
	S.D.	1.13	1.41	
		(N=8)	(N=8)	

Of the many meaningful statistical comparisons between leavers and remainers for the above groups, for all of the available testing period data, only one comparison showed a statistically significant change. The 12 leavers in the 14/15 year-old experimental group showed a significant decrease on this alienation measure for the period between May and August.

Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale

Table 22

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.) on the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale for Children for each Group Tested for Two Test Periods

		Testing 1	Testing 2
14/15 year-old Experimentals	Mean	15.64	16.59
	S.D.	3.66	4.76
		(N=50)	(N=49)
16/18 year-old Controls	Mean	14.00	
	S.D.	5.38	
		(N=45)	
14/15 year-old Controls	Mean	16.29	16.45
	S.D.	5.10	7.14
		(N=51)	(N=51)

This test was administered at the May and August sessions. The major finding on this measurement was a significant difference between all the 16/18 year-old controls and all the 14/15 year-olds (both groups) in that the older girls had a significantly lower score ($p < .02$), thus indicating a more internal locus of control. The only other difference approaching significance was a tendency toward greater internalized locus of control ($p < .10$) in the 14/15 year-old experimental group in comparison to the 14/15 year-old controls. Unfortunately, this instrument was not administered initially so that long term (7 months) program effects are not available. No difference was noted between the two 14/15 year-old groups as related to the summer program. The significant finding of higher internalized controls on the part of the 16/18 year-old group can most parsimoniously be explained as a result of the age factor inasmuch as the normative data on this test shows a consistent increase towards internalized controls with age. It is of note that the findings on all three groups are consistently toward a more external orientation, when compared with the standardization groups, which consisted in part of a small (but unknown) number of black girls. At any rate, the findings on the 16/18 year-old group are comparable to the means of 7th graders (12/13 year-old females) in the norm's sample. A similar finding in comparison to the norms was ascertained for both the 14/15 year-old groups. Here, all the 14/15 year-old girls' means were in the 5th-6th grade (10/11 year-old females) ranges. These findings of consistently higher external orientation (that is, a perception of luck, chance and fate etc., determining the results of her action) are very similar to previous research findings among black populations (Lefcourt, 1972).

Table 23

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.) on the Nowicki-Stickland Locus of Control Scale for Leavers and Remainers for Experimentals and Older Controls

		Testing 1	Testing 2
14/15 year-old Experimental Remainers	Mean	15.00	15.03
	S.D.	3.58	4.19
		(N=37)	(N=36)
14/15 year-old Experimental Leavers	Mean	17.25	21.42
	S.D.	3.42	2.81
		(N=12)	(N=12)
16/18 year-old Control Remainers	Mean	13.38	
	S.D.	5.40	
		(N=37)	
16/18 year-old Control Leavers	Mean	16.87	
	S.D.	4.55	
		(N=8)	

A comparison of remainers for the two testing sessions indicates there were no significant changes in the 14/15 year-old experimental group. However, a comparison of the experimental group leavers for the same summer phase yielded a significant movement ($p < .005$) toward greater external locus of control. The comparable grade level equivalents of the norms are a shift from means similar to 5th grade girls, to a mean below the 3rd grade. This indicates a kind of disillusionment effect on those individuals who have participated for a time in the NYC program and are then discontinued for whatever reason. Furthermore, although this change toward a greater orientation of chance or luck in regards to outcome of her own actions, is already manifested in a comparison of leavers and remainers in May 1973 ($p < .06$), a most rapid change toward an external orientation was found to have taken place between the May and August testing in the experimental group leavers.

A much less striking difference, approaching significance ($p < .09$) was found between leavers and remainers in the older control group. Again, the remainers tend toward internal orientation in their locus of control perceptions. It is worthy of note that if it is assumed that internalized locus of control is necessary to "make it in the system," then the present finding suggests that successful NYC program participation at least maintains a level of internal orientation.

However, dropping out of the NYC program is likely actually to cause greater orientation toward the perceived importance of chance and luck factors in effects of behavior or actions. Actually, it might be argued that being dropped from the NYC program, for whatever reason, reinforces and substantiates the orientation of fate, luck and fortune as being important factors in outcomes, with a corresponding lower perception of control over their own lives. Other Manpower Administration research suggests this phenomenon as well.

Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale

The following table presents the findings on the Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale.

Table 24

Means and Standard Deviations (S.D.) on Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale for each Group at the Three Test Periods

		Testing 1	Testing 2	Testing 3
14/15 year-old Experimentals	Mean	61.60	62.74	57.49
	S.D.	9.36	9.32	12.97
		(N=50)	(N=50)	(N=49)
16/18 year-old Controls	Mean	59.58	60.89	
	S.D.	8.98	8.98	
		(N=45)	(N=45)	
14/15 year-old Controls	Mean	62.04	60.04	55.29
	S.D.	10.48	11.35	20.35
		(N=51)	(N=51)	(N=51)

Appropriate statistical analysis comparing the groups on each test and the tests for each group reveal the following statistical significance: a comparison of the two 14/15 year-old groups for the third testing, reveals that the 14/15 year-old experimental group achieved higher Piers-Harris scores than the 14/15 year-old control group at the 10% level of probability. Indirect substantiation for the notion that NYC program participation will contribute to the maintenance of a positive self concept, may be deduced from the findings that both groups at work maintained the same level of self concept for at least 7 months in the 16/18 year-old control group, and for 9 months in the 14/15 year-old experimental group. At the same time, Piers-Harris Self Concept scores declined significantly for the 14/15 year-old control group during the same 9 month period. The tests of significance for the three Piers-Harris Self

Concept samples of the 14/15 year-old control group over time reveals that the group's mean scores decreased for each of the two comparison periods (7 and 9 months, respectively). The Piers-Harris scores went down significantly from testing period two to testing period three ($p < .06$) and the scores went down significantly from testing period one to three ($p < .05$).

It is noteworthy that the means of all our black female subjects, at least at the outset of the project, are well in the upper ranges of the normative sample. Thus, aside from the significant changes (decreases) for the 14/15 year-old control group, and the maintenance of self concept in the older and younger working groups, other important issues must be considered. A thorough review of the self concept literature of blacks and comparative black-white studies, suggests that there is no consistent evidence for the "commonly stated assumption that blacks' expressed self-estimates are lower than whites" (Christmas, 1973); the view that status may be more important than race as an influential demographic factor on self concept, and the manifestations of the new positive black consciousness (e.g. "Black is Beautiful"), have yet to be thoroughly documented in young people.

The findings in this study of an above average self concept for all our black female study subjects then, substantiates the rejection of the commonly held assumption of lower self concept in blacks, but does not address itself directly to the effects of status and new black consciousness on self concept. A testable hypothesis thus may be forwarded: namely, that the absence of peer groups may be one variable associated with lowered self concept in this project, and may have failed to provide the 14/15 year-old control youngsters the opportunity of new black consciousness as was provided for the experimental group through the peer groups. It should be noted that the black female role model was a part of the peer-interaction group experience.

Table 25

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.) of Remainers and Leavers in 14/15 Year-old Experimentals and 16/18 Year-old Controls on Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale

		Remainers			Leavers		
		Test 1	Test 2	Test 3	Test 1	Test 2	Test 3
14/15 year-old Experimentals	Mean	62.00	63.27	63.16	59.33	60.17	40.00
	S.D.	9.68	8.91	9.37	7.97	10.36	3.10
		(N=37)	(N=37)	(N=37)	(N=12)	(N=12)	(N=12)
16/18 year-old Controls	Mean	59.35	61.65		60.62	57.37	
	S.D.	9.10	8.37		8.91	9.40	
		(N=37)	(N=37)		(N=8)	(N=8)	

The most dramatic finding is manifested in the remainer-versus-leaver comparisons at the final testing period. Here we find that the leavers in the 14/15 year-old experimental group scored significantly lower ($p < .0002$) than they did on their previous tests at the beginning and end of Phase 1. Furthermore these leavers scored significantly lower ($p < .00001$) than the comparable remainers at the third testing period in August. In addition, the leavers scored significantly lower again than the 14/15 year-old control group at the third testing in August 1972. Although it was found that the 14/15 year old control group's Piers-Harris Self Concept scores deteriorated from May to August 1972, it was by no means as dramatic as the drop in self concept scores of the 14/15 year-old experimental group leavers for the same time period. It is clear that a potent event, or series of events had an impact on the leavers between May and August 1972.

It could be hypothesized that this depressed self concept score in August was, at least in part, a function of their discontinuation of participation in the NYC. Although other variables may have had an impact on decreasing self concept, the same is not true for the 14/15 year-old controls, as the latter's scores did not decrease as dramatically.

If we assume that this lowered self concept was, at least partially, related to dropping out (or being pushed out) of the NYC program, important program-development and implementation notions arise. For example, it might be demonstrable that disappointment in partially met expectations (e.g. discontinuation of participation in a personally

satisfying program) may create as many new individual problems as the program tries to solve. What short and long-range negative effects on individual program participants are there if the person discontinues (for whatever reason) a personally satisfying experience? This question can and should be tested empirically.

Stinchcombe Student Attitude Scale

On this scale (administered only at the outset of the project), a comparison was first made of the experimental remainers, older control group remainers and the younger non-working controls.

Only some marginally significant findings have been noted, which are here detailed:

1. The experimental group is involved in less extra-curricular office-holding activity in school than the younger controls.

2. The experimental group comes from smaller families than the older controls.

3. The fathers of the experimental group are more likely to be working than are the fathers of the other two groups.

More significant data emerges, however, when the findings on the experimental group and the younger controls (both 14/15 year-old groups) are combined and then compared with the findings on the 16/18 year-olds. The following are the significant results of that comparison:

1. College attendance is more probable for the younger groups than the older group, based on their own statements.

2. The older group were more certain as to their perception of interest versus boringness of certain courses, than the younger groups. This would indicate that the older group has a much clearer perception of attitudes and feelings about components of school work, than the younger groups.

3. The older group indicates that they have spent more time, or are spending more time, on homework than the younger groups. (This may be a function of the volume of homework assigned.)

4. The older group dates significantly more than the younger groups.

5. The younger groups are significantly more conforming to teacher expectations and teacher control than the older group, with respect to dress codes and expectations of cleanliness of attire.

6. The younger groups agree that politeness is a desirable trait, significantly more than the older group.

7. The younger groups feel the necessity to "be in good with the teacher" in order to secure good grades in school, significantly more than the older group so feels.

8. The younger groups seem to have a stricter behavior code than the older group. This is attested by a greater degree of expression, that a lot of students do not behave themselves well enough, by the younger groups, than is revealed by the older group.

9. The younger groups are likely to change clothing style more rapidly than the older group.

10. The security-giving aspect of work after graduation seems to be more significant to the younger groups than to the older group. Also, the importance of friendly relationships with co-workers on the job, is significantly more desirable to the younger groups than to the older group.

11. The younger groups are significantly more interested in potential income from employment than is the older group.

12. A significantly larger number of the older group wish to be remembered in high school as brilliant students, in preference to being athletic or popular, as compared to the younger groups.

13. The younger groups have lived in their particular geographic area longer than the older group.

Next, the research team analyzed findings on the Stinchcombe questionnaire between the entire group of 126 remaining in the program (May 1973) as compared with the 20 who had dropped out or been removed for various reasons. Some interesting indicators arose from this comparison:

1. Those who dropped out received significantly more failure notices from the schools, than those who remained in the project.

2. Only 5% of the leavers had definite college plans while 39% of the remainers had such plans.

3. Of those who dropped out, 45% were living in a home in which the father was not resident, whereas 62% of the balance of the subjects were living in like circumstances.

4. Of those who did have fathers living in the home, 70% of the leavers had fathers who were unemployed while only 30% of the balance of the subjects had fathers who were unemployed.

S.S.D.S.Questionnaire

This questionnaire (administered first in May) covered subjects' attitudes toward family, school, and expectations of the future, together with other factors as perceived by the respondents.

A comparison of experimental remainers (N=38) with the younger

controls (N=51) yielded significant differences on these items:

1. The younger controls indicated that they wanted to understand their own children better than they were understood ($p < .05$).

2. The younger controls have more older siblings under 18 ($p < .10$).

3. The younger controls feel they have been disciplined more often unfairly ($p < .10$).

4. The younger controls state that they will have to work harder on the job after graduation ($p < .10$).

5. The younger controls feel that their friends are less certain that they (the subjects) will graduate from high school ($p < .10$).

Combining the two 14/15 year-old groups, and comparing the questionnaire results with the remainers of the older control group, the following significant differences emerge at the May testing:

1. The combined younger groups ranked the "wife" role as less attractive on a realistic estimate as to what they will be doing 10 years from now ($p < .01$).

2. Similar findings ($p < .05$) emerge on the same question in terms of role desirability.

3. The younger groups ranks "sales" as a less attractive realistic guess as to what they will be doing 10 years from now($p < .05$).

4. The younger groups feel that there is one thing in life they will never have ($p < .05$).

5. The younger subjects report significantly more likelihood of having obtained treatment for some health problem ($p < .10$).

6. The younger subjects would like to live "elsewhere" more than in Memphis ($p < .10$).

7. The younger groups feel it appropriate for other students they know to have dropped out of school ($p < .10$).

8. The younger subjects feel their mothers are easier on them in comparison to friends' mothers ($p < .10$).

A comparison of remainers (N=38) and leavers (N=12) in the experimental group reveals the following differences on this May questionnaire:

1. The remainers state significantly more often that they will have to work harder on the jobs they want than the effort now expended on school work ($p < .01$).

2. The remainers rank "domestic work" as a significantly less likely actuality for themselves in 10 years ($p < .02$).

3. The remainers know significantly fewer other students who have dropped out of school since the beginning of the school year ($p < .05$).

4. The remainers feel that their best friends expect them to graduate from high school to a significant degree ($p < .05$).

5. The remainers feel significantly more satisfied that they have been taught to read and write well in school ($p < .10$).

6. The remainers report significantly larger numbers of people under 18 living with them at home ($p < .10$).

A comparison of the experimental group leavers (N=12) and the 16/18 year-old control leavers (N=8), yielded two significant differences:

1. The older leavers feel that they were disciplined less fairly ($p < .10$).

2. The older leavers wish their mothers to be more like those of their friends ($p < .10$).

The same questionnaire was changed by deleting items 1 - 53 from the May form and adding questions 136 - 140 on the new form (Appendix E) for the final instrument administered in August. A comparison of experimental remainers with the 14/15 year-old controls yielded the following significant differences:

1. The experimental remainers feel it less likely that they will be doing domestic work in 10 years from now ($p < .01$).

2. The experimental remainers feel they do not have an older person who would talk to them when they are discouraged more than the controls ($p < .10$).

A comparison of leavers (N=12) and remainers (N=37) for the 14/15 year-old experimental group revealed the following significant differences on the August questionnaire:

1. The remainers state that their families feel certain that they will graduate from high school ($p < .01$);

2. The remainers state that their best friends feel certain that they (the subjects) will graduate from high school ($p < .01$).

3. The remainers do not want their mothers to be like those of their best friends ($p < .02$).

4. The remainers state that they know an older person who talks with them when they feel discouraged ($p < .01$).

5. The remainers feel that their mothers are less strict than those of their friends ($p < .01$).

6. The remainers' realistic occupational expectancy 10 years hence for themselves is more toward the teaching, social work, medical and nursing professions ($p < .01$).

7. At the same time, the remainers' realistic occupational expectation 10 years hence is less likely to include aspiration toward being a stewardess, model, singer or salesperson ($p < .01$).

8. The remainers, after getting the kind of job they want, expect to work harder than they now do in school ($p < .01$).

While there were a few differences between the various groups at the May testing period, most of the findings and their levels of significance might parsimoniously be explained as expected chance events, from a probability point of view. However, this can not be asserted for the findings on the final comparison in August, between leavers and remainers in the experimental group. It would be expected that of the 30 tests of significance performed on this questionnaire, less than one comparison should be significant at the 2% level of confidence. However, 9 (item 7 has 2 comparisons reported) such statistical comparisons yield significant differences. This number of differences is much beyond chance and thus may be considered true differences.

From the data analysis it appears that the 14/15 year-old experimental

group remainers can be characterized as being different from the experimental group leavers in that they feel their families and friends have greater confidence in them concerning their school achievement, feel preference for their mothers as they are, have higher aspiration levels and realistic expectations regarding work requirements for projected occupations for themselves.

Baughman and Dahlstrom Interview Schedules

Interviews were conducted with a random selection of eight subjects from each of the three groups and their respective mothers.

Statistical analysis of these results would not generate significant data, because of the nature of the information and the small size of the test population. The research team chooses instead to include a descriptive narrative drawn from these responses, identifying significant patterns of differential answers.

Impressionistic findings of theresearch team include the notion that the experimental group, in addition to being more outer-directed and conforming, also displays higher aspirations and is more upwardly mobile in attitude than either of the other two groups.

This is evident in terms of such factors as length and extent of education which they plan for themselves, value placed on dress and appearance, and general conformity when compared with the responses of the other two groups.

These notions are supported, in the view of the research team, by analysis of the interview responses. The most significant of these responses are detailed in Appendix F.

A general finding which emerges from these interviews is that the mothers of the experimentals appear to be much more specific in their likes and dislikes, and in their descriptions of child behavior and family life, than are the mothers of the other two groups. This kind of response occurs in relation to family matters and child behaviors which bother the mothers, when it is contrasted with the responses

of the mothers in the other two groups, where almost no specificity of response occurs.

Another significant response is that the mothers of the experimentals indicate in half the responses, that their children should learn to fight sometimes. This is not true with the mothers of the other two groups. It is suggested that the experimental group consists, in large measure, of young people who are upwardly mobile and ambitious, and this view of the mothers is therefore significant, as indicating that one may have to fight sometimes to get ahead.

The findings and responses of the parents' interviews are digested in more detail in Appendix F.

VIII. Comments and Discussion by Research Team

A.

There is ample literature to indicate that the black female adolescent group in the United States is most highly vulnerable both to unemployment and to unemployability. (Twentieth Century Fund, 1971; Parnes, 1971).

The combination of factors affecting the employability of all adolescents includes lack of work experience, low levels of skill, lack of knowledge of appropriate work behavior, and little or no experience in the world of work. For the black female adolescent, these problems are compounded and intensified by less adequate levels of appropriate formal education as well as race and sex discrimination in employment systems. Further, generally lower levels of upward mobility motivation are the product of life experience in the ghetto, which clearly transmits to youngsters the failures of the employment systems as they observe their parents and older peers.

At the same time, this study has indicated that there are some characteristics of black adolescent females, and significant characteristics of their mothers and families, which produce a more self-confident and aggressively realistic person, much more likely to want to succeed in penetrating employment systems and being productive in them. The provision of effective and successful role models and peer supports for black adolescent girls may be assumed to be significant, particularly if such role models are intimately involved in the work experience of the black girl in a youth employment program while she is still in school.

Further, such peer group supports, linked to successful role models, seem to have a major effect on the school success of the black adolescent girl, perhaps contributing to her acceptance of achievement values in the school system as a way of moving out and up.

It would therefore appear that effective strategies leading toward success of black females in both school and work systems may be constructed from the findings of the study herein reported. If the personality characteristics of success-oriented young black females could be identified and strengthened, and if peer reinforcement groups effectively directed by successful black female role models could be demonstrated to produce positive outcomes, much could be contributed to program designs and developments.

The pursuit of such studies as the current one could contribute strongly to employment and training strategies for black adolescent girls. Recommendations for the pursuit of such research and demonstration appear in Section II.B.

B.

It need not be expanded on here that characteristic of the adolescent condition is the search for independence, occupational or career choices, and a firm sense of identity. Yet, contemporary society provides few channels through which these normal aspirations can be achieved during the adolescent years. The family system, work systems, the school system, and the religious system all combine to maintain the adolescent in an adult-directed, adult-managed series of institution structures. The frustrations emerging from this drive for independence and identity, frequently not acceptable in these systems, contribute to the difficulty which the adolescent encounters in his roles of child-becoming-adult, student-becoming-graduate, dependent-becoming-independent.

In the framework of the adolescent condition in the United States, and the special additional factors of the black urban poor adolescent, the NYC program has been in part designed to provide some level of access to independence and to the world of work. Its objectives have been multiple. While 21 selection criteria were recently enumerated (Appendix A), the Ozgediz survey concludes:

> "As indicated by the choice of 'severely disadvantaged with average academic performance' by 79% of the 701

> programs and as further observed during the field work, there exists widespread 'creaming' in the selection process. Rather than looking at NYC as a program to serve the most needy youth, many local programs are viewing it as a vehicle for rewarding the disadvantaged, but academically successful youth."

It appears, therefore, that the vast majority of such programs are in fact selective of candidates with a high potential for success, either by design or by unexamined individual and personal reactions on the part of those who select. Further, this may occur in some instances as the result of interpretations of national guidelines. This process is described as "creaming" by Ozgediz. The research team suggests the following stages of this process:

1. Variable awareness of the existence of the program by adolescents;
2. Perception of adolescents as to whether they would be "acceptable" or "qualified";
3. Degree of guidance counselor encouragement to apply;
4. Rating system by local NYC offices';
5. Special efforts by guidance counselors on behalf of some applicants;
6. Selective terminations during the course of the program.

It is the intent of this comment to indicate that the selection process is multi-level in its execution.

First, there is little basis on which to assume that all eligible adolescents in appropriate schools know or do not know the NYC program exists.

One might next deal with the perception which adolescents have of themselves in the school system, as they compare themselves

with what they perceive the NYC program to be. At this stage, many adolescents who regard themselves as "poor students" or "school problems" will, it is assumed, not apply and thus eliminate themselves.

Another level of creaming must inevitably exist in terms of guidance counselor selection for recommendation. In this area, the guidance counselor may deal with his own definition of student financial needs, personal preferences, or his independent assessment of student capability to undertake part-time work in view of his academic standing and role definition in the school.

Beyond this, an additional creaming off can occur in the NYC administrative mechanism and guidelines for the selection of appropriate applicants, and for the certification of those applicants as appropriate. In some instances, this transaction occurs by the examination of records. In others, where interviewing may occur, the attitudes of the interviewers are inevitably involved.

Further, guidance counselors may in some instances strongly recommend and attempt to influence the selection of certain preferred individuals.

And finally, creaming off can occur during the course of any youth employment program, when some adolescents may be terminated for a variety of reasons, some of which involve judgments of such factors as poor attitude, low level of productivity, failure to follow instructions, bad record on evaluation and similar causes.

Nevertheless, many students succeed in such programs. They are the survivors of the above selection and creaming process. They earn money, they maintain a level of conformity and productivity in the expected part-time work role, and they obviously maintain effective student roles as perceived both by the managers of their school experience and the managers of their work experience.

Since this creaming off process does in fact continue to occur despite evaluation and guideline changes in the course of the past decade, it is here suggested that such currently existing youth employment programs are not susceptible to change by intervention at a federal level.

As to the adolescents who are never selected, or the adolescents who are terminated, there is little evidence that such programs have ever reached out to them, or supplied any of the necessary supports which would enable them to enter and be maintained in such a program. Youth employment programs are generally not funded and staffed to supply such an outreach component.

In short, it appears that the youth employment system is institutionalized and bureaucratized.

It is therefore suggested than an examination be undertaken of the characteristics of the adolescents themselves who are successful in such programs as they exist in reality, and not in terms of how such programs could be changed. Recommendations on this subject are made in some detail in Section II.B. Youth employment programs do in fact serve the useful purposes outlined above (see Section II) for those youth who have comparatively high potential for success.

It would logically follow that such youth employment programs would be more effective and efficient if there were a sound basis for effective selection of success potentials among the adolescents who apply. In short, since creaming is characteristic of youth employment programs, it would be far better if this were done purposefully and effectively.

In the course of this study, the research team has identified many useful selection criteria, both psychological and social, which may be readily utilized in an effective pre-testing (creaming) process. The development and application of such pre-tests would improve the potential for selecting youth who have high success probabilities for such programs. There are demographic, family constellation, sociological and psychological variables associated with success in these programs. The research connected with this study has identified many of these variables.

It therefore seems appropriate to utilize the data gleaned in this study for the purpose of creating, and then testing, an instrument or series of instruments which will have a high level of validity and reliability in identifying applicants with potential for success in youth employment programs.

This recommendation is intended in no way to suggest that special programs designed to meet the needs of adolescents' low success probabilities are unnecessary or undesirable. Rather what is intended is to enhance youth employment programs as they exist, and thus to insure their greater impact. Programs especially designed for youth with high success probabilities must be developed on bases other than those described as characteristic of present ones.

C.

Extending the above remarks in another direction, it is noted that the hope and expectation of In-school NYC and similar programs anticipates a linkage between these programs and useful occupational choices by the adolescents who participate. Nevertheless, there are no data available which substantiate this supposition. In fact, as indicated above, there is little literature at all on this subject.

It would appear, therefore, that much of the data generated in this study could be utilized for the development of a methodology for identifying, describing and implementing the occupational

choice-making process. In this connection, the research team notes that any program geared to further the development of upwardly-mobile occupational choice-making must have a theoretical base from which to generate data, in order to test the appropriateness of such a program.

There is minimal theory in this area of occupational choice-making process during early and late adolescence. Further, the research team notes that there is almost no definitive research in this area yielding substantial data. In order for youth employment programs to be successful in maximizing the potential of the youth who participate, it would be necessary to identify the stages of the occupational choice-making process. The research team supports the view that there are definable stages in this process. If these stages could be identified and their characteristics studied and known, then effective programs could be appropriately planned and tested to serve youth.

It appears that the serious beginnings of this choice-making process occur in early adolescence and continue through late adolescence and early adulthood. Appropriate methods of defining and evaluating the stage of development of each individual must be devised. Such an instrument (or series of instruments), once adequately developed and tested, can then be used to assess the stage of occupational choice-making of specific individual enrollees. It can also be used as a base for instituting appropriate interventive techniques which will assist individuals through the process.

D.

In short, the thrust of this brief commentary approaches three basic points:

1. The typical NYC In-school program during the school year, as analyzed in this study as well as in other studies referred to, is selective as to the students who are chosen to participate. That selectivity is a reality. The research team believes that this selection should

be performed in an orderly and systematic fashion. Research in this area should be continued.

2. There is a body of unexamined assumptions that job-related skills and interests will be developed in the course of youth employment programs, which will positively affect the occupational choice-making process.

3. It is in no way suggested by these comments that employment-related programs are not needed for youth with low success probabilities. The fact of high selectivity of high success probability youth in youth-employment programs should not be interpreted as suggesting that low success probability youth are not in need of help. On the contrary, low success probability youth not only require help, but require specially designed programs. It seems clear, from this study and other literature, that the normative NYC program and other youth-employment programs, do not meet these special needs. The suggestion of this comment is that there are at least two tracks, or two kinds of programs required. The normative NYC type program can serve selected populations. Special programs need to be developed and tested for populations less likely to succeed.

IX. References

Baughman, E. Earl and Grant Dahlstrom. Negro and White Children: A Psychological Study in the Rural South. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Bialer, Irving. "Conceptualization of Success and Failure in Mentally Retarded and Normal Children." Journal of Personality, Vol. 29, No. 3, 1951.

Cattell, Raymond B. and Mary B. Cattell. Handbook for the Junior-Senior High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ). Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1969.

Christmas, June Jackson. Self-Concept and Attitudes in Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States. Kent S. Miller and Ralph Mason Dreger, editors. N.Y. and London: Seminar Press, 1973.

Ezekiel, Raphael S. "The Personal Future and Peace Corps Competence." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Supplement, Vol. 8, No. 2, Part 2, Feb. 1968.

Ezekiel, Raphael S. Document #9736. Washington, D. C.: Auxiliary Photo Duplication Service, Library of Congress.

Freeburg, Norman E. and Richard R. Reilly. Development of Guidance Measures for Youth Work Training Program Enrollees. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1971.

Gochman, David S. "Some Correlates of Children's Health Beliefs and Potential Health Behavior." Journal of Health and Social Behavior, Vol. 12, 1971.

Gottlieb, David and Charles E. Ramsay. The American Adolescent. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1964.

Havighurst, Robert J. Human Development and Education. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1953.

Lefcourt, Herbert M. Recent Developments in the Study of Locus of Control in Progress in Experimental Personality Research. Brendan A. Maher, editor. New York: Academic Press, 1972.

McClosky, Herbert and John H. Schaar. "Psychological Dimensions of Anomie." American Sociological Review, Vol. 30, No. 1, 1965.

Middleton, Russell. "Alienation, Race and Education." American Sociological Review, Vol. 28, No. 6, 1963.

Nowicki, Stephen Jr. and Bonnie Strickland. "A Locus of Control Scale for Children." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, Vol. 40, No. 1, 1973.

Ozgediz, Selcuk. Survey and Analysis of In-School NYC Programs. Washington, D. C.: Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1973.

Parnes, Herbert S. Years for Decision, Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1971.

Piers, Ellen and Dale B. Harris. Manual for the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale. Nashville, Tenn. Counselor Recordings, 1969.

Rotter, Julian B. Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, Vol. 1 (whole #609), 1966.

Rotter, Julian B. Social Learning and Clinical Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Seeman, Melvin. Alienation and Engagement in the Human Meaning of Social Change. Angus Campbell and Philip E. Converse, editors. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press, 1972.

Somers, Gerald D. and Ernst W. Stromsdorfer. A Cost-Effectiveness Study of the In-school and Summer Neighborhood Youth Corps. Washington, D. C.: Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1970.

Srole, Leo. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study." American Sociological Review, Vol. 21, No. 6, 1956.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, Inc., 1964.

Tatsuoka, Maurice M. Discriminant Analysis: The Study of Group Differences. Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.

Twentieth Century Fund, eds. The Job Crisis for Black Youth. New York: Praeger Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.

U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. The Neighborhood Youth Corps: A Review of the Research." Washington, D.C.: Manpower Research Mimeography #13, 1970.

U. S. Congress. "Difficulties of the NYC In-school Program and Its Management Problems." Report by Department of Labor. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, Publication B-130515, 1973.

Wallace, Phyllis A. Unemployment Among Black Teenage Females in Urban Poverty Neighborhoods. Washington, D.C.: Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1972.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT CHARACTERISTICS IDENTIFIED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FOR CONSIDERATION BY SPONSORS IN ENROLLEE ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS

1. Being a member of a poverty-level household (according to current poverty guidelines).
2. Having frequent absenteeism.
3. Having poor grades and repeated subject failure.
4. Having financial problems.
5. Frequently transferring from one school to another.
6. Having an immediate desire to work and earn money.
7. Having health problems or physical disfiguration.
8. Being over average high school age.
9. Being married or pregnant.
10. Having a record of repeated confrontations with police.
11. Having overcrowded living quarters.
12. Having family members who dropped out.
13. Having social difficulties with peers.
14. Having peers with dropout records.
15. Having an unstable household.
16. Having alcoholism or drug addiction in the family.
17. Having parents who lack interest and do not participate in school affairs.
18. Having a lack of parents' support guidance.
19. Having attitudinal or adjustment problems.
20. Having a lack of motivation.
21. Having an unwillingness to have learning ability tested.

Appendix B

Agency Site Visits

Although the research contractor was clearly to have no functional relationship with the sites in which the Enrollees or the members of the control Group 2 worked, an observation site visit was conducted to each of the seven work sites in which the Enrollee group worked. These site visits were conducted in April 1973.

Five of the sites appeared to be adequately administered, with structured schedules and structured work arrangements for the Enrollees. One of the remaining two sites appeared to be an adequate work setting, although there was lack of clarity in administrative supervision. In only one work setting was the research team dissatisfied with the quality and style of work, and this site was abandoned for the summer program.

The member of the site visit team who conducted all seven visits maintained an observation posture, and made every effort not to become involved in the work being performed by the Enrollees.

The general content of each site visit report is indicated in the following outline:

1. Geography and environment
2. Observed function and activity
    a. Enrollees
    b. Rap Leaders
    c. Other Staff
3. Type of program operated by agency
4. Feeling, atmosphere, and style of work setting, as it applies to the learning experience of the Enrollee.

The seven site visit reports follow.

In all but one instance the work settings were found to provide both stimulation and involvement of the Enrollees in the work to which they were assigned. There seemed to be a universal acceptance of the Enrollees as useful helpers and assistants in working with children in an after-school day care program. They were presented with more than adequate opportunities for responsibility, and there was strong indication that they met these effectively.

The work styles of the agency sites were informal, and the staffs appeared to be both open and anxious to involve the Enrollees in making an effective contribution to the recreation and care of the younger children.

Simmons Estates - 3729 Knight Arnold Road

1. This is a Memphis Housing Authority Development where the entire program is housed in a couple of rooms, about 4,000 square feet. The housing development itself is rather desolate and barren, with no greenery or trees, and all activities take place either in a central building, which is air conditioned, or out on the bare ground. There seems to be normal Housing Authority atmosphere, with little meaningful interaction between the Housing Authority staff and the residents.

2. Most of the work done by the Enrollees is in the nature of general supervision in the game room, where the Enrollees are present and interact with children at opportunity. In some instances, the Enrollees are assigned specific activity groups, and when this is done, they usually work together with a staff member. The Enrollees seem to cluster together a bit, and I did notice some Enrollees participating as the kids in various activities in the game room. During my observation, the rap leaders were functioning as general game room supervisors, working directly with individual kids and not particularly focusing on the NYC Enrollees. In two instances I noted the rap leader and the Enrollee dealing with individual kids. During the time that I was there, no specific activity groups were in progress. The agency did seem to be well staffed, with several members working the open game room activity, and a couple of staff members working outside with some kids.

3. The agency seemed to be primarily focused on the open game room activity program, although it was indicated to me that special activity groups did in fact exist and just were not operating at the time that I was there.

4. There seems to be an excellent rapport among Enrollees, staff, rap leaders, and children. There is a warmth and friendliness about the operation that does not at all seem in place in the drab and dreary setting of the housing development. The children seem enthusiastic to be there, and several that I talked with were very positive and warm in their responses to the NYC Enrollees. The addition of specific group activities would seem to complete this as a positive, profitable work setting for Enrollees.

Girls Club - 686 North 7th St.

1. The building is warm and receptive to participation. It is a large massive house converted into a community center with a gym attached. There seems to be a great deal of freedom and flow through the building, with unrestricted movement from group to group and activity to activity. The neighborhood seems to be a poor, but clean, neighborhood, and the children that I saw seemed to be reasonably happy.

2. Enrollees seem to serve both in the function of direct group leader and assistant group leader. In a couple of the activity groups, I saw Enrollees teaching skill activities such as crafts, while in others I saw them assisting in free play and supervision of open activity areas. Rap leaders were being used as direct group leaders, and each of the two rap leaders had either one or two Enrollees working with them. I noted three other staff who were working directly with Enrollees or with groups where Enrollees were also working. In general, the atmosphere was one of high productivity and activity,

with an abundance of children seeming to use the leadership skills provided by both Enrollees and rap leaders.

3. The general kind of program provided by the agency would be in two categories. They are open activity areas programs where people came and recreated, and special group activities programs with some sort of specific focus and a membership which fluctuated among the girls present at the agency.

4. This is the best site that I have observed so far. I think Enrollees coming out of this setting will not only feel that they have accomplished something in terms of working with children, but will feel that they are a real and viable part of a work experience.

Walnut Park Apartments - 202 West Red Oak

This is a privately owned housing development financed by Federal funds through a private developer. It seems to be rather clustered and jammed with no clear open space to play in, and all activities focus in the activity building with about 3,000 square feet of space and a small fenced-in yard adjacent to it. While the overall atmosphere was not dismal or dreary, it was not truly conducive to recreation or group activities in the sense that the housing development itself seemed too busy and anxious and introverted to really care what was happening in this after-school program.

2. At the time of my visit, all of the En rollees were actively involved in working with children. The children were divided into two groups, and four Enrollees were assigned to each group of 15 or 20 children. One group was outside playing ball, and the Enrollees were playing with them, while the other group was inside doing crafts and quiet games, and the Enrollees were working well with them. At the time I arrived, one rap leader was outside acting as supervisor with the children who were playing ball, and the other rap leader was inside doing record work. Both rap leaders seemed quite interested and involved in what was happening, and were well aware of the nature of the program and the goals of the program. I only saw two other staff people while I was there, and I have the distinct impression that only four or five staff people are present at any given time. The agency executive was there, but she looked to the rap leaders for direction in this program.

3. There are no specific activities groups at this agency, and the general activity area with programs at given times seems to be the rule.

4. I have a feeling that this is a viable, alive program, with the Enrollees certainly led to assume responsibility for directing and operating programs. The Enrollees seem to take a mature responsible attitude toward the children, and feel responsible for their actions. There seems to be no friction with the rap leaders, and a working relationship has evolved. I feel that more supervision probably could be given to the Enrollees, as it seems that the rap leaders and the staff are willing to let them assume almost complete authority over the children. However, it does not seem to be hampering the desired outcomes of the program, so perhaps it is a good move.

Goodwill Homes for Children - 4590 Goodwill Road

1. Formerly a residential home for girls, this has been converted into a multi-purpose community center, with the after-school program as an adjunct to it. The after-school component is run by OP ACT, and uses the open-space area in the rear, the ball field, and one of the out-buildings for the locus of its program. It is in the Geeter area, and services a neighborhood of approximately 100 square blocks.

2. The day I viewed the program was a bright sunny day, and all of the activities seemed to be out-of-doors. The Enrollees were participating in games with the children, and it was hard to tell whether they were leading the activities or participating in them as children. As I watched, a couple of disputes arose, and Enrollees did take on the function of arbitrater. One rap leader was present that day, and I noted that the rap leader was supervising the general activities. Other staff were also in evidence in appropriate staff functions. The general atmosphere was that of Enrollees functioning as junior counselors or assistant counselors, with staff functioning as activity supervisors or senior counselors. I did notice the mass of children broken into 3 or 4 distinct group activities, with staff and NYC Enrollees spread out appropriately. I understand that activity groups also occur at the agency. However, while I was observing, general open activity seemed to be the rule.

3. During my observation, the prime thrust of the program was toward general open activity, with staff assigned to activity areas. In looking over the physical layout, I noted what looked like specific projects in the enclosed areas, and I could draw the inference from this that activity groups did exist, although it was not possible to tell whether these groups had fixed enrollments or were simply activity-focused as per the interest of the individual child.

4. I noted a warm, responsive feeling toward the agency and staff on the part of the NYC Enrollees. The Enrollees seem to feel as if they were part of the operation with staff responsibilities, although they let those lag significantly when they found themselves in games settings. I believe this is natural to a fourteen or fifteen year old although the agency staff could perhaps focus on it a bit.

Riverview Community Center - 1891 Kansas St.

1. Riverview Community Center is a new Memphis Park Commission community center service a multi-purpose function in the Kansas Street-South Parkway area. At the time of the visit, the community center was showing only minimal use, with a senior adult program in operation and a couple of children playing ball in the gym. The demonstration project here used the Headstart facility for its physical location, and the project is one of the 3 Headstart operations. The center is in good condition, and the space available is adequate. The lighting is good, and equipment seems plentiful.

2. When I arrived, the Enrollees were all present and had begun to play with the 10 or 12 youngsters who were there. I got there about 5 minutes before scheduled startup time, and found that the only staff in the agency was the director of the day care center. I asked where the task supervisors or rap leaders were and found out that there were no task supervisors available except for the rap leaders in this agency. It also seemed that the rap leader was holding down a

different job which did not allow her to get to work within the first 10 or 15 minutes of the program. The second rap leader was going to school, and her classes did not let out in time for her to be there at the beginning of the program. It seemed to me that the Enrollees were not only offering service to the children and the agency, but were actually running the program. They seemed to be doing quite an adequate job of it, and seemed well organized and knew what was expected of them. The agency director seemed somewhat put out with the fact that her rap leaders did not show up on time, and did not attempt to make excuses for them; she simply praised the Enrollees for being able to function in that situation.

3. The program that was operating was a general gameroom program with no small group activities noticeable. When I was there most of the activity was outdoors, focused on typical recreation activities such as ground ball, soft ball, small group games,etc. I had the distinct feeling that this was the extent of organization of activities of this agency.

In terms of the learning experience of the Enrollees, I think that this setting probably breeds initiative and the ability to undertake independent action, since I truly feel that there is a minimum of good structured direction in this agency. I personally do not recomment its continuation for this type of demonstration project with the existing staff.

Warren Apartments - 1344 Clementine

1. Warren Apartments is located on Clementine and Bellevue and is a Percy Galbreath housing development under Federal funding. The space available for use is a Headstart center, located in the main office complex of the housing development. The space is rather cramped, with 2 small rooms which serve as day care centers, being available for the after-school program. In addition, a clutter of materials seemed to dominate the area giving the impression that people would probably be falling over each other. This did not seem to be a hindrance to the program, however, as the children and Enrollees seemed quite comfortable in the surrounding, and seemed to have adequate space for various programs.

2. The Enrollees had general supervisory duties, but there were some small group activities in this setting. Children seemed to be divided by age group, with 2 or 3 Enrollees assigned to each group. The Enrollees seemed involved in the activities strongly, and were playing lead roles in working with the children.

The rap leaders seemed to exhibit a high degree of committment and involvement with the Enrollees, overdoing this to the point where they organize parties and activities for the Enrollees beyond the normal scope of the program. It was from this agency also that the identification of a medical need of an Enrollee was picked up and handled. Rap leaders clearly focused on the various activities appropriate to the function, and seemed to engender in the Enrollees a sense of dedication and mission to the job. I did not meet the site director on my visit.

3. The agency seemed to be operating a general open gameroom activity program, with some special activity groups structured into it. Enrollees seem to be assigned to these special activity groups with direct responsibility for running the activities in them.

4. I hear that this was a good learning experience for the Enrollees and that the setting did provide those components which we felt necessary for continued use for a demonstration center. I feel that perhaps the rap leaders in this setting go a step or two too far in overrelating to the Enrollees. However, error in this direction cannot be all bad.

St. Thomas Girls Club - 588 East Trigg

1. St. Thomas Girls Club is located on East Trigg, serving a mixed girl and boy population. The atmosphere in the agency is warm and cordial, with a pervasive feeling that children enjoy coming into this agency and feel welcome in it. I do not get the hustling feeling of activity in this agency that I felt at the North Memphis Girls Club, but I do not know if the service population statistics are the same. This agency serves almost exclusively a poverty population from the immediate neighborhood, which includes both single unit dwellings, multiple unit dwelling, and housing projects of various kinds..

2. The Enrollees in this agency seem to be as sharp as any Enrollees we have in the program. They were extremely responsive to directions as best I could tell, and seemed completely engrossed in the work they were doing. The rap leaders and the task directors were working directly with the Enrollees in working with the children. I noticed some confusion in the line of authority; there seem to be several types of authority exercised within the agency, but I could not clearly identify this nor place enough emphasis on it to deal with it at the moment. It did not seem to inhibit the direct work with the youngsters that the Enrollees were doing. The director of this Girls Club site seems to be a person not too cognizant of the area of chain of command or subordinates. However, this is only an impression, which was further substantiated by later activities at this Girls Club.

3. The program was operated in small club activities fashion, with some mass gameroom programs and some area designations for the Enrollees. This means that the Enrollees could be assigned to the craftshop, with a flow of kids in and out of the shop, or they could be assigned to the general gym area with responsibility for anyone in that area. This is normal operational function for this agency in its day-to-day activities, and the Enrollees seem to be being used appropriately within the structure of the agency.

4. I feel that the learning experience for the Enrollee in the setting is constructive and positive, with the possible exception of the lack of clear authority lines. The rap leaders seem to relate positively with a great deal of support and a great deal of positive enthusiasm to the Enrollees, and the Enrollees seem to enjoy their work as well as learn from it. These rap groups have produced and are producing good interchange with the Enrollees and I feel this setting should be continued.

Appendix C

Rap Leader Reports

To protect the design of the program in its first phase, which placed the rap leader directly under the supervision of the agencies, rather than under the supervision of the research team, minimum contact was made with the rap leaders by the research team.

However, in mid-April one written instrument was administered to the rap leaders, seeking their observations and evaluations of the rap sessions from their inception during the previous fall, until mid-April.

The results of this exploration were encouraging, and some of the highlights of these reactions follow. There is no attempt to undertake statistical analysis, but rather the research team has selected some key responses in order to illuminate some of the characteristics of the rap sessions.

This mid-April report seems to indicate positive movement by the enrolees in greater activity, contribution, and participation in the rap sessions.

In all, 13 responses were received, although there were 14 rap leaders.

Eleven of the rap leaders reported that the discussions were "fairly good" to "active." Changes which had occurred were in the direction of more active participation and more individual input into the rap sessions by the enrolees.

Further three rap leaders identified better working relationships among the enrolees as having occurred, and five noted that the enrolees responded more freely and were more involved in interaction as time went on.

Eleven of the leaders reported "highly active" participation, and also reported that 8 - 10 of the enrolees had changed from "silent" to "comparatively active" roles in the rap sessions. No rap leaders reported that any enrolees had changed from "fairly active" to "silent" or "fairly silent."

Eleven of the leaders reported that the subjects of rap sessions were selected "half-and-half" by the enrolees and the leaders. Ten leaders reported that certain subjects kept returning again and again in the rap sessions. Six of the leaders reported that these subjects were sex-related topics, four reported venereal disease as a returning subject, and others topics were scattered among career choices, social activities, drug abuse, educational issues and planned parenthood.

As to attendance and activity, eleven of the leaders reported very few absences and the other two reported a single frequent absentee with the rest regular in attendance. Ten of the leaders reported that the rap sessions had been held weekly without fail, and two other leaders reported that one or two sessions were missed during the entire 5-month period. One leader did not respond to this question.

Eleven of the leaders reported "fairly good" cooperation during the rap sessions. Six of these reported that this cooperation was different from the way it had been at the beginning, with half of these indicating that getting over enrolee bashfulness and shyness was a factor.

Six of the leaders reported some behavioral trouble with the girls in rap sessions at the beginning, but not later, and four reported no trouble at all in the entire period.

As to the rap leaders themselves, their average age was 21.6 years, ranging from two 18-year olds to one 26-year old. Twelve were single and one married. One rap leader was at that time in high school, eight were in college, and four were graduate students.

Their longevity of experience in the agency was minimal, with the most experienced rap leader having been in that agency slightly over two years. On the other hand, ten of the leaders had been with that agency less than six months. Eight of the rap leaders had no previous experience in this type of work. However, among other work experiences were included social work, counseling, teaching school, group work, and career development specialist.

The research team notes at this point that the selection of rap leaders rested with the agencies, and there was apparently an effort to recruit young black rap leaders with appropriate experience and interests. This is also apparent from the rap leaders' career preferences, which included counseling, teaching school, social work, special education, work with delinquents, and similar careers. Among the various career preferences indicated, there were nineteen such human service career indications in a total of twenty-six choices indicated.

Indications from the rap leaders as to what they enjoyed most in that role were not decisive. Three rap leaders indicated they enjoyed discussion, and this was the largest single indication. However, job satisfaction seemed apparent, since nine of the thirteen respondents did not respond to the question of what they enjoyed least as rap leaders.

The rap leaders, as agency employees, seemed generally to have a positive view of the agencies in which they worked. Ten of them performed other work at the agency in addition to serving

as rap leaders. All thirteen respondents were able to identify their immediate supervisor and to know the title of that supervisor.

It appears to the research team, therefore, that the rap leaders were well selected and functioned effectively in their agencies and in the rap leader role. Their ages, level of education, personal appearance, and career aspirations, all seemed to meet the requirements of serving as effective role models for the enrolees.

The summer model involved selection of rap leaders by the research team, together with orientation and weekly monitoring.

For the summer period, eight rap leaders were selected. The age range was 18 to 24. One was an elementary school teacher, six undergraduate college students, one graduate student.

During this period, the subjects discussed and the mode of their selection approximated the earlier modes, although the frequency of rap meetings was increased from once to twice weekly.

The summer leaders reported a more erratic pattern of enrolee participation and interest. Less regular attendance, shorter attention span, and a greater use of the rap group by enrolees for job-related complaints - were the reported predominant patterns. The summer heat and the use of uncomfortable facilities, frequently outdoors, for rap groups, may have played a part in these patterns.

Two other factors were also at play. One of these was, of course, the introduction of new rap leaders to ongoing groups. Another, equally inaccessible to evaluation, was the extended period of uncertainty on the part of enrolees as to whether they would work during the summer.

However, despite these factors, the research team notes with interest the findings previously described as the "summer syndrome," in which positive maintenance of gains was characteristic for the enrolees.

Appendix D

Percentages of Average Daily Attendance, 1971-72 and 1972-73, Schools Attended by Subjects

	1971-72		1972-73	
	7-9	10-12	7-9	10-12
Carver	90	90	87	87
Central		94		92
Cypress	92		91	
Douglass	93	89	93	87
East	95	94		89
Fairley	93	93	91	90
Geeter	93	92	90	88
Hamilton	94	92	92	89
Hillcrest	94	92	91	91
Humes	91		89	
Lincoln	92		90	
Lester	93	89	93	
Melrose	92	89	93	86
Messick	93	93	92	92
Mitchell	92	90	91	86
Northside		90		87
Oakhaven	95	93	93	92
Porter	91		88	
Riverview	94		91	
Sheffield	94	93	93	92
Southside		89		87
Tech		91		87
B.T. Washington		88		82
Westwood	93	92	92	87
Whitehaven	96	94	95	92

Appendix E

Tests used in the study

Freeburg-Reilly Work Supervisor's Rating Scale

NAME OF NYC WORK SITE _____

WORK SUPERVISOR'S NAME _____

NAME OF ENROLLEE YOU ARE RATING _____

HOW MANY WEEKS HAS THE ENROLLEE WORKED FOR YOU _____

TODAY'S DATE _____

Below are 10 statements about things that work supervisors consider important when it comes to how the Enrollee is doing. We would appreciate your telling us how each one applies to this Enrollee. The information is strictly private and will not have any effect on the Enrollee in any way.

Please read each statement carefully. Then put a check on <u>one</u> of the five blanks to show how that statement fits the Enrollee that you are rating.

1. SHOWS SOME INITIATIVE IN TAKING ON A PIECE OF WORK.

This describes just how the Enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the Enrollee	This is not usually so	The Enrollee is not like this at all
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. RESENTS TAKING ORDERS FROM THOSE WHO SUPERVISE HER.

This describes just how the Enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the Enrollee	This is not usually so	The Enrollee is not like this at all
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. SHOWS INTEREST IN LEARNING MORE ABOUT THE JOB.

This describes just how the Enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the Enrollee	This is not usually so	The Enrollee is not like this at all
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

4. CAN'T GET TO WORK ON TIME.

This describes just how the Enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the Enrollee	This is not usually so	The Enrollee is not like this at all
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

5. HAS TO BE TOLD WHAT TO DO EVERY MINUTE OR SHE CAN'T KEEP BUSY

This describes just how the Enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the Enrollee	This is not usually so	The Enrollee is not like this at all
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

6. ASKS QUESTIONS IF PROBLEMS COME UP - DOES NOT JUST GO AHEAD AND DO THE JOB WRONG.

This describes just how the Enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the Enrollee	This is not usually so	The Enrollee is not like this at all
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

7. IS OFTEN ABSENT FROM WORK.

This describes just how the Enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the Enrollee	This is not usually so	The Enrollee is not like this at all
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

8. SHOWS SOME PRIDE IN THE WORK AND DOESN'T JUST RUSH THROUGH TO GET IT FINISHED.

This describes just how the Enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the Enrollee	This is not usually so	The Enrollee is not like this at all
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

9. WASTES TIME ON THE JOB.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the Enrollee	This is not usually so	The Enrollee is not like this at all
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

10. CAN BE LEFT ON HER OWN WITHOUT CLOSE SUPERVISION.

This describes just how the Enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the Enrollee	This is not usually so	The Enrollee is not like this at all
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Ezekiel's Fictionalized Autobiography

Please write a short make-believe composition (essay) describing the way you think your life will be for the next five years.

Please write a short make-believe composition (essay) of your life as if you were 30 years old. That is, write how you imagine your life to be between now and when you will be 30.

Bialer Locus of Control and Three Anomie Scales

Instructions - Please read each question carefully and answer each question to tell us if you agree or do not agree. There are no right or wrong answers; but only what is right or wrong as you see it. So, if you agree with the sentence or question, circle the word "yes"at the end of the sentence. If you do not agree with the sentence, circle the word "no" at the end of the sentence. You may not agree or disagree completely with some of the questions or sentences. But we want you to make a "yes" or "no" choice even if you are not completely sure.

1. Are people mean to you even if you do not do anything to make them mean? Yes No

2. Do you ever think that people your age can change things that are happening in the world? Yes No

3. If someone was going to hit you, would you be unable to stop him? Yes No

4. Is it hard for you to know why some people do the things they do? Yes No

5. Is it useless to think about what you will be when you get older? Yes No

6. When someone gets mad at you can you usually do something to make him your friend again? Yes No

7. Is it true that people your age have nothing to say about where they are going to live? Yes No

8. When you get in an argument, is it sometimes your fault? Yes No

9. When nice things happen to you, is it only good luck? Yes No

10. Will people usually do things for you if you ask them? Yes No

11. When bad things happen to you, could it be your fault that they happen? Yes No

Srole Anomie Scale

12. There is not much I can do about most of the important problems that we face today. Yes No

13. Things are so complicated in the world today that I really don't understand just what is going on. Yes No

14. In order to get ahead in the world today, you are almost forced to do some things which are not right. Yes No

15. I am not much interested in the TV programs, movies, or magazines that most people seem to like. Yes No

16. I often feel lonely. Yes No.

Middleton Anomie Scale

17. I don't really enjoy most of the work that I do, but I feel that I must do it in order to have other things that I need and want. Yes No

18. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse. Yes No

19. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world the way things look for the future. Yes No

20. These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on. Yes No

21. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself. Yes No

22. There's little use in writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man. Yes No

McClosky & Schaar Anomie Scale

23. With everything so uncertain these days, it almost seems as though anything could happen. Yes No

24. What is lacking in the world today is the old kind of friendship that lasted for a lifetime. Yes No

25. With everything in such a state of disorder, it's hard for a person to know where he stands from one day to the next. Yes No

26. Everything changes so quickly these days that I often have trouble deciding which are the right rules to follow. Yes No

27. I often feel that many things our parents stood for are just going to ruin before our very eyes. Yes No

28. The trouble with the world today is that most people really don't believe in anything. Yes No

29. I often feel awkward and out of place. Yes No

30. People were better off in the old days when everyone knew how he was expected to act. Yes No

31. It seems to me that other people find it easier to decide what is right than I do. Yes No

Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale

Please read each question carefully and answer each question to tell us if you agree or do not agree. There are no right or wrong answers; but only what is right or wrong as you see it. So, if you agree with the question or sentence, fill in the blank under the letter "A" on the answer sheet. If you do not agree with the sentence, fill in the blank under the letter "B" on the answer sheet. In other words, "A" means yes and "B" means no. You may not agree or disagree completely with some of the questions or sentences. But we want you to make a choice even if you are not completely sure. Be sure that the number of the question and the number on the answer sheet where you put your answer are the same. Do not fill in answers "C", "D", or "E" for any questions.

81. Do you believe that most problems will solve themselves if you just don't fool with them?

82. Do you believe that you can stop yourself from catching a cold?

83. Are some kids just born lucky?

84. Most of the time do you feel that getting good grades means a great deal to you?

85. Are you often blamed for things that just aren't your fault?

86. Do you believe that if somebody studies hard enough he or she can pass any subject?

87. Do you feel that most of the time it doesn't pay to try hard because things never turn out right anyway?

88. Do you feel that if things start out well in the morning that it's going to be a good day no matter what you do?

89. Do you feel that most of the time parents listen to what their children have to say?

90. Do you believe that wishing can make good things happen?

91. When you get punished does it usually seem its for no good reason at all?

92. Most of the time do you find it hard to change a friend's opinion?

93. Do you think that cheering more than luck helps a team to win?

94. Do you feel that it's nearly impossible to change your parent's mind about anything?

95. Do you believe that your parents should allow you to make most of your own decisions?

96. Do you feel that when you do something wrong there's very little you can do to make it right?

97. Do you believe that most kids are just born good at sports?

98. Are most of the other kids your age stronger than you are?

99. Do you feel that one of the best ways to handle most problems is just not to think about them?

100. Do you feel that you have a lot of choice in deciding who your friends are?

101. If you find a four leaf clover do you believe that it might bring you good luck?

102. Do you often feel that whether you do your homework has much to do with what kind of grades you get?

103. Do you feel that when a kid your age decides to hit you, there's little you can do to stop him or her?

104. Have you ever had a good luck charm?

105. Do you believe that whether or not people like you depends on how you act?

106. Will your parents usually help you if you ask them to?

107. Have you felt that when people were mean to you it was usually for no reason at all?

108. Most of the time, do you feel that you can change what might happen tomorrow by what you do today?

109. Do you believe that when bad things are going to happen they just are going to happen no matter what you try to do to stop them?

110. Do you think that kids can get their own way if they just keep trying?

111. Most of the time do you find it useless to try to get your own way at home?

112. Do you feel that when good things happen they happen because of hard work?

113. Do you feel that when somebody your age wants to be your enemy there's little you can do to change matters?

114. Do you feel that it's easy to get friends to do what you want them to?

115. Do you usually feel that you have little to say about what you get to eat at home?

116. Do you feel that when someone doesn't like you there's little you can do about it?

117. Do you usually feel that it's almost useless to try in school because most other children are just plain smarter than you are?

118. Are you the kind of person who believes that planning ahead makes things turn out better?

119. Most of the time, do you feel that you have little to say about what your family decides to do?

120. Do you think it's better to be smart than to be lucky?

Stinchcombe Student Attitude Scale

This is an attitude questionnaire, not a test; there are no right and wrong answers. Please check only one answer to each question, unless there are directions to do otherwise. Try to answer every question. Do not spend very much time on any one question.

1. Year in school?

   1. Freshman_____
   2. Sophomore_____
   3. Junior_____
   4. Senior_____

2. Age at last birthday?

   1. 13_____
   2. 14_____
   3. 15_____
   4. 16_____
   5. 17_____

3. Do you belong to any school clubs or organizations which you attend fairly regularly (at least 1 out of each 2 meetings)?

   List (if any) 1._____
   2._____
   3._____
   4._____

   If you hold office, what office?_____

4. Do you belong to any church group which you attend fairly regularly (at least 1 out of each 2 meetings)?

   List (if any) 1._____
   2._____

   If you hold office, what office?_____

5. Do you belong to any neighborhood or city-wide clubs or organizations which you attend fairly regularly (at least 1 out of each 2 meetings)?

   List (if any) 1._____
   2._____
   3._____
   4._____

   If you hold office, what office?_____

6. Do you play on any athletic team on which you are a regular or a substitute?

   List (if any) 1._____
   2._____
   3._____
   4._____

7. Do you belong to any hobby groups or classes which you attend fairly regularly (at least 1 out of every 2 meetings)?

List (if any) 1._____
2._____
3._____
4._____

8. What freshman high school math class did you take? (If you are a freshman, which are you taking now?)

1. Arithmetic_____
2. General or Basic Math_____
3. General Business_____
4. Algebra_____
5. None_____

9. Please check the English class you are now taking.

Freshmen

1. Remedial Reading_____
2. Remedial English_____
3. General English_____

Sophomores

1. Remedial Reading II_____
2. Remedial English II_____
3. General English II_____
4. Advanced English II_____

Juniors

1. Remedial Reading III_____
2. Remedial English III_____
3. General English III_____
4. Advanced English III_____
5. Honors English III_____

Seniors

1. General English IV_____
2. Advanced English IV_____
3. Honors English IV_____
4. No English_____

10. Have you ever received a notice from the counseling office for flunking a class or doing poor work in a class?

1. Yes_____
2. No_____
3. Don't know_____

11. Which type of class did you get a flunk notice for? (Check as many as you got notices in, whether or not you actually flunked.)

1. Advanced English_____
2. A Foreign Language_____
3. A Laboratory Science_____
4. College Prep Math (algebra, geometry, trig)_____
5. Orientation_____
6. Social Studies (including Health)_____
7. General or Remedial English_____
8. General Science or General Biology_____
9. Electronics or Conservation_____

10. General Business_____
11. Basic math, Arithmetic, or Consumer math_____
12. Any business class except General Business_____
13. Any Shop class (including Mechanical Drawing)_____
14. Physical Education_____
15. Any Home Economics class_____
16. Any Music class_____
17. Any Arts or Crafts class_____
18. Agriculture or Forestry_____
19. None_____

12. What would you say was your average grade in high school subjects?

1. Mostly A's_____
2. Mixed A's and B's_____
3. Mostly B's_____
4. Mixed B's and C's_____
5. Mostly C's_____
6. Mixed C's and D's_____
7. Mostly D's_____
8. Mixed D's and F's_____
9. Mostly F's_____
10. Don't know_____

13. How many times have you been into the Attendance Office for an Unexcused Absence?

1. Never_____
2. Once or Twice_____
3. 3 or 4 times_____
4. More than 4 times_____
5. Don't know_____

14. Have you ever skipped school with a gang of kids (whether or not you got caught)?

1. Yes_____
2. No_____
3. Don't know_____

15. Have you ever been sent out of class to the Attendance Office by a teacher you didn't get along with?

1. Yes_____
2. No_____
3. Don't know_____

16. Have you ever had your program changed because you didn't get along with a teacher?

1. Yes_____
2. No_____
3. Don't Know_____

17. What curriculum are you (or think you will be) most interested in in high school? (Please check only one answer.)

1. Vocational Industrial Arts_____
2. General Education_____
3. College Preparatory_____
4. Vocational Agriculture_____
5. Business Education_____
6. Don't Know_____

18. What type of job would you like most of all to be doing ten years from now?

1. Skilled worker (for instance, plumber, machinist, auto mechanic)_____
2. Entertainer_____
3. Clerical or secretarial work_____
4. Sales clerk or salesman_____
5. Professional work (for instance, doctor, lawyer, teacher, engineer)_____
6. In a small business for yourself_____
7. Farm Owner or worker_____
8. Housewife_____
9. A good paying job in a mill, factory, or in the woods_____
10. Other (What?)_____
11. Don't Know_____

19. What sort of job do you think you will probably really have ten years from now?

1. Skilled worker_____
2. Entertainer_____
3. Clerical or Secretarial_____
4. Sales Clerk or Salesman
5. Professional work_____
6. Small business for yourself_____
7. Farm owner or worker_____
8. Housewife_____
9. A job in a mill, factory, or woods_____
10. Other (What?)_____
11. Don't know_____

20. Have you definitely decided whether or not to go to college?

1. Definitely decided to go_____
2. Definitely decided not to go_____
3. Not decided_____
4. Don't Know_____

21. (If you are not decided, or don't know, answer this question.) What do you think you probably will do, go to college or not?

1. Probably will go_____
2. Probably will not go_____
3. Don't Know_____

22. Do your parents urge you to go to college and to take college preparatory subjects in high school?

1. Yes, strongly urge_____
2. Yes, moderately urge_____
3. No, leave it to my own decision_____
4. No, urge me to get a job_____
5. Don't Know_____

23. How many of your subjects this year would you say were pretty boring?

1. All boring_____
2. Only one or two interesting_____
3. About half and half_____
4. Only one or two boring_____
5. All interesting_____
6. Varies too much too say_____
7. Don't Know_____

24. What is your opinion on the amount of homework given in your classes?

1. Too much homework given_____
2. About the right amount given_____
3. More homework should be given_____
4. Don't Know____

25. How much time, on the average, do you spend doing homework outside school?

1. None or almost none_____
2. Less than 1/2 hour a day_____
3. About 1/2 hour a day_____
4. About an hour a day_____
5. About 1 1/2 hours a day_____
6. About 2 hours a day_____
7. 3 or more hours a day_____

26. Suppose you had an extra hour in school and could either take a course of your own choosing, or use it for athletics or some other activity, or use it for study hall. How would you use it?

1. Course_____
2. Athletics_____
3. Club or activity_____
4. Study hall, to study_____
5. Study hall, to do something else_____

27. How important would you say your getting good grades was to your parents?

1. Very important_____
2. Quite important_____
3. Somewhat important_____
4. Not very important_____
5. No importance at all_____
6. Don't Know_____

28. How important would you say your grades were to getting the kind of job you want?

1. Very important_____
2. Quite important_____
3. Somewhat important_____
4. Not very important_____
5. No importance at all_____
6. Don't know_____

29. How important would you say your grades were to your own satisfaction?

1. Very important_____
2. Quite important_____
3. Somewhat important_____
4. Not very important_____
5. No importance at all_____
6. Don't know_____

30. Have you personally cheated on any assignment or test or in reporting your grade, or have any of your friends cheated for you when correcting one of your tests, during the past month?

1. Yes, I have cheated_____
2. Yes, friend cheated for me_____
3. No, neither_____
4. Don't know_____

31. Do you date?

1. No_____
2. Yes, about once a month_____
3. Yes, once every 2 or 3 weeks_____
4. Yes, about once a week_____
5. Yes, about twice a week_____
6. Yes, about three or four times a week_____
7. Yes, more than four times a week_____

32. It's a student's own business if he wants to smoke, and the school should do away with the smoking boundaries.

1. Strongly agree_____
2. Agree_____
3. Indifferent_____
4. Disagree_____
5. Strongly disagree_____
6. Don't Know_____

33. In getting a good job, how you look is generally more important than what you can do.

1. Strongly agree_____
2. Agree_____
3. Indifferent_____
4. Disagree_____
5. Strongly disagree_____
6. Don't know_____

34. Teachers should give good grades for neatness on themes and assignments, as well as knowledge of the subject.

1. Strongly agree_____
2. Agree_____
3. Indifferent_____
4. Disagree_____
5. Strongly disagree_____
6. Don't know_____

35. Teachers have a right to expect cleanliness and neatness in dress, and should enforce this by basing grades partly on personal neatness.

1. Strongly agree_____
2. Agree_____
3. Indifferent_____
4. Disagree_____
5. Strongly disagree_____
6. Don't know_____

36. Teachers generally respect a polite person who does poor work in a class more than a good student who is impolite.

1. Strongly agree_____
2. Agree_____
3. Indifferent_____
4. Disagree_____
5. Strongly disagree_____
6. Don't know_____

37. A small group of students run the activities and the student government, and you can't do anything unless you're in with them.

1. Certainly true_____
2. Probably true_____
3. Probably false_____
4. Certainly false_____
5. Don't know_____

38. Coaches and supervisors of student activities play favorites.

1. Certainly true_____
2. Probably true_____
3. Probably false_____
4. Certainly false_____
5. Don't know_____

39. You have to get in good with the teachers if you expect to get a fair grade in this school.

1. Certainly true_____
2. Probably true_____
3. Probably false_____
4. Certainly false_____
5. Don't know_____

40. It doesn't matter very much how hard you work in a class - your grade is pretty much set when you first come in.

1. Certainly true_____
2. Probably true_____
3. Probably false_____
4. Certainly false_____
5. Don't know_____

41. One thing wrong with this school is that a lot of students don't behave themselves well enough.

1. Certainly true_____
2. Probably true_____
3. Probably false_____
4. Certainly false_____
5. Don't know_____

42. One thing wrong with this school is the number of "squares" among the students, who would rather follow all the rules than have any fun.

1. Certainly true_____
2. Probably true_____
3. Probably false_____
4. Certainly false_____
5. Don't know_____

43. Most parents would feel uncomfortable coming to see a teacher or to a PTA meeting.

1. Certainly true_____
2. Probably true_____
3. Probably false_____
4. Certainly false_____
5. Don't know_____

44. The Attendance Office is out to get certain people, more than to apply the rules fairly.

1. Certainly true_____
2. Probably true_____
3. Probably false_____
4. Certainly false_____
5. Don't know_____

45. When a new clothing style comes out, how soon do you change to the new style?

1. I'm usually one of the first in my group to change_____
2. I change about the same time most other people in my group change_____
3. I usually don't change until most of my friends have changed_____
4. I don't follow the change at all_____
5. Clothing styles don't matter to me_____

46-50. Rank the five items below in terms of their importance to you on a job. (Ranking 1 as most important, 2 as next important, and so on.)

46. The security of steady work_____
47. The opportunity for a rapid rise_____
48. The enjoyment of the work itself_____
49. Friendly people to work with_____
50. A high income_____

51-54. Different people strive for different things. Here are some things that you have probably thought about. Among the things you strive for during your high school days, just how important is each of these? (Ranking 1 as most important, 2 as next important, and so on.)

51. Pleasing my parents_____
52. Learning as much as possible in school_____
53. Living up to my religious ideals_____
54. Being accepted and liked by other students_____

55. If you could be remembered here at school for one of the three things below, which one would you want it to be?

1. Brilliant student_____
2. Athletic star_____
3. Most popular_____

56. What age would you say was the earliest age at which a girl ought to consider getting married, supposing that she had been asked by a man she would like to marry?

1. Any time_____
2. She should be at least 16_____
3. At least 18_____
4. At least 20_____
5. At least 22_____
6. Over 22_____
7. No opinion_____

57. One student said, "I would feel embarrased to bring some kids I know at school home to stay over a weekend." Have you ever felt you would be embarrased to bring any student you have met home with you?

1. Have felt that way_____
2. Have neverfelt that way_____
3. Can't recall_____

58. How long have you lived in this school district?

1. Came during this school year_____
2. Came since entering high school, but before this year_____
3. Came during grade school or junior high_____
4. Came before entering grade school_____
5. Lived here since birth_____
6. Don't know_____

59. (If you have moved to this area since birth, answer this question.) What part of the country did you live in just before you came to this area?

1. Another place in Tennessee_____
2. Oregon or Washington_____
3. The "Border" states (Kentucky, Arkansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, Maryland)_____
4. The Rocky Mountain States_____
5. The Midwest_____
6. New England or Middle Atlantic_____
7. Outside of the United States_____

60. Do you live with both your parents, with one of them alone, one of them and a step-parent, or with neither of them?

1. Both parents_____
2. Mother alone_____
3. Father alone_____
4. M other and Stepfather_____
5. Father and Stepmother_____
6. Neither mother nor father_____

61. How many brothers and sisters do you have (not counting yourself)?

1. None_____
2. One_____
3. Two_____
4. Three_____
5. Four_____
6. Five_____
7. Six_____
8. Seven_____
9. Eight or more_____

62. Is your father (or stepfather) working now?

1. Working_____
2. Unemployed_____
3. Not living with Father or Stepfather_____
4. Don't know_____

63. What sort of work does your father (or Stepfather) do? (If he is retired or dead, what sort of work did he generally do when working?)

1. Professional work (requiring college, such as doctor, lawyer, teacher, accountant, engineer)_____
2. Owns or manages a business (for instance, small sawmill, store, filling station, construction)_____
3. Works as a salesman or salesclerk (such as insurance or real estate salesman, furniture salesman, farm or logging equipment salesman)_____
4. Works in an office doing clerical, secretarial, or similar work (for instance, timekeeper, bank teller, stock clerk, or work behind a desk)_____
5. Skilled worker or foreman (for example, carpenter, plumber, millwright, machinist, auto mechanic, foreman in the mill or in the woods)_____
6. Mill or factoryworker, truck driver, cab driver, logging worker, or similar semi-skilled work_____
7. Service worker (for instance, gas station attendant, janitor, barber, bartender or waiter)_____
8. Works for a government agency as an official (city, state, or federal, with people under him)_____
9. Works for a government agency as a mailman, fireman, policeman, repairing roads, etc._____
10. Farmer or farm worker_____
11. Other, or can't decide which_____

64. What kind of clothes does your father's (or Stepfather's) job make him wear?

1. Relatively dressed up (for example, shirt and tie; suit or sports jacket)_____
2. A uniform_____
3. Work clothes_____
4. Don't know_____

65. Does your mother have a job outside the home?

1. Yes, full time_____
2. Yes, part time_____
3. No_____
4. Not living with mother or stepmother_____

S.S.D.S. Questionnaire

This is a questionnaire asking information about some important things in your life. Although this is not a test, it is important to try to answer all of the questions as carefully as possible. The effort you put into this questionnaire is your way of helping to plan future youth programs. All of your answers will be kept confidential. Please try to keep your answers short.

Short Answer Section

1. What did you like best about school this year?_____

2. What did you like least about school this year?_____

3. What is the most important thing that has happened to you since school started last August?_____

4. Why does it seem like the most important thing?_____

5. Who would you say makes most of the important decisions in your family?_____

6. Think again of the person in your family who makes most of the important decisions. How far in school does that person expect you to go?_____

7. How certain do you think this person is that you will graduate from high school? (Please put a check-mark somewhere along the line from 0 to 100).
0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

8. Are you satisfied that you have been taught to read and write well in school?_____

9. If not, do you think you will ever be able to learn these skills well?_____

10. When you are a mother, what would you like to say to your children's teacher if they are not learning how to read and write well?

11. How much importance do you think employers (boss) should give to an employee (worker) being able to spell properly?

12. WHY?

13. How many people under 18 years of age live where you live?_____

14. How many people over 18?_____

15. How many under 18 are full brothers or sisters?_____

16. How many under 18 are older than you are?_____

17. What was the highest year of schooling that your mother completed?

_____

18. Your father?_____

19. Do you think your best friends will graduate from high school?

_____

20. Did you ever repeat a year in school?_____

21. Do you know of any health problems that you have now?_____

22. If so, does anyone else know about it?_____

23. Does this problem worry you sometimes?_____

24. Have you been able to get any treatment for it?_____

25. Where would you say you grew up?_____

26. If you could live any place you wanted, where would that be?

_____Foreign country
_____West coast
_____Northern city
_____Memphis
_____In the country or on a farm
_____Elsewhere. Write where:_____

27. Have you ever been hungry or without food for more than a day?_____

28. When did this happen?_____

29. Think again of the person in your family who makes most of the important decisions. Can you think of one time in the past year when you were able to talk to that person about something that was really troubling you?_____

30. Suppose you had a really serious problem and felt like you simply had to talk to somebody about it. Do you know anyone who you could trust well enough to tell about it?_____

31. See if you can describe why you trust this person._____

_____

32. Do you think this person could be of real help in solving this problem?_____

33. How old is that person?_____

34. Is this person a man or woman?_____

35. Do you know anyone who has dropped out of school since school started last August?_____

36. Do you think this person might be better off in the long run for doing that (dropping out)?_____

37. Do you have a room of your own at home?_____

38. How much TV are you able to watch Monday through Friday after school?_____

39. Think of a person who is a good friend or relative who has had or now has a good job. What is their job?_____

40. How far did this person go to school?_____(Please guess if you don't know)

41. Would you like to have a job something like this?_____

42. Why?_____

43. What is the greatest problem that you see between you and getting a job like that?_____

44. Can you think of one important thing that you could do for yourself that might really improve your chances of someday getting a job like that?_____

45. What is that one thing?_____

46. Imagine that it is ten years from now. How much money do you think you will be making from your job? (or, if you imagine being married then, how much do you think your husband will be making?)_____

47. How likely do you think it is that this amount will really be on the paycheck? (Please put a check-mark somewhere along the line from 0 to 100).

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

_____

43. Everybody has things happen to them sometimes that make them feel disappointed. Think of something that made you feel especially disappointed since school started last August. What happened to make you feel this way?_____

_____

_____

49. Did you talk to anybody else about it?_____

50. As you look back on it now, can you think of anything that you might have done differently so that you might have been able to make it turn out better for yourself?_____

51. What could you have done that might have made it turn out better for you?_____

_____

52. How far do you expect to go in school?_____

53. What do you honestly think are your chances of graduating from high school? (Please put a check-mark somewhere along the line from 0 to 100).

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

_____

Multiple Choice

Please check only one answer in each question. Please put check-mark on the line in front of your choice.

54. In comparison to the mothers of your friends, would you say that your mother

_____is much more easy and lets you do many more things than your friends' mothers let them do?
_____is somewhat more easy?
_____treats you just about the same?
_____is somewhat more strict?
_____is a lot more strict and doesn't let you do a lot of things your friends' mothers let them do.

55. Do you ever feel like you have been disciplined unfairly?

_____never
_____occasionally
_____ often
_____all of these

56. Rank the following occupations (job) choices: Put a 1 in front of the group you'd most like to be doing in 10 years, a 2 before the group next most desired, and a 3 before the group of occupations (job) next desired, and so on.

_____secretary, office worker, receptionist
_____teacher, social worker, nurse, doctor
_____stewardess, model, singer
_____wife and mother
_____domestic work
_____sales lady

57. Now rank the same occupations (jobs) in the same way according to <u>your most realistic guess</u> of what you will <u>actually</u> be doing 10 years from now.

_____secretary, office worker, receptionist
_____teacher, social worker, nurse, doctor
_____stewardess, model, singer
_____wife and mother
_____domestic work
_____sales lady

58. After you get the kind of job you want, will you have to work: (check one)

_____with less effort than is necessary in school now
_____with about the same effort that is necessary in school now
_____with more effort than is necessary in school now
_____with a lot more effort than is necessary in school now

<u>True or False</u>

Please circle True (T) or False (F). Circle (T) if you agree with the sentence, circle (F) if you disagree.

59. T F My family feels certain that I am going to graduate from high school.

60. T F My best friend feels certain that I am going to graduate from high school.

61. T F I wish my mother were more like some of my friends' mothers.

62. T F When I get discouraged, I know an older person who likes to talk to me and who can usually cheer me up.

63. T F It may be true that poor people can't afford to be completely honest.

64. T F I need to become more honest with myself.

65. T F My mother has not helped me with my homework this year.

66. T F I can do everything just as well as my mother can.

67. T F I have never lied to my mother about anything that's important.

68. T F I want to be able to understand my children better than my mother understands me.

69. T F The one thing I want most in life is something I know I'm never going to have.

Project Questionnaire

Please read each sentence. If you agree with the sentence, please mark the blank under "A" on the answer sheet. If you don't agree with the sentence, mark the blank uner "B" on the answer sheet.

True or False

*121. My family feels certain that I am going to graduate from high school.

122. My best friend feels certain that I am going to graduate from high school.

123. I wish my mother were more like some of my friend's mothers.

124. When I get discouraged, I know an older person who likes to talk to me and who can usually cheer me up.

125. It may be true that poor people can't afford to be completely honest.

126. I need to become more honest with myself.

127. My mother has not helped me with my homework this year.

128. I can do everything just as well as my mother can.

129. I have never lied to my mother about anything that's important.

130. I want to be able to understand my children better than my mother understands me.

131. The one thing I want most in life is something I know I'm never going to have.

Multiple Choice

Please check only one answer in each question. Please put check-mark on the line in front of your choice on this page, and not on the answer sheet.

132. In comparison to the mothers of your friends, would you say that your mother

_____Is much more easy and lets you do many more things than your friends' mothers let them do?
_____Is somewhat more easy?
_____Treats you about the same?
_____Is somewhat more strict?
_____Is a lot more strict and doesn't let you do a lot of things your friends' mothers let them do.

*Since this questionnaire was revised for the second administration, the numbers of the questions were changed, and will therefore not match with the original question numbers.

133. Do you ever feel like you have been disciplined unfairly?

_____Never
_____Occasionally
_____Often
_____All of these

134. Rank the following occupations (job) choices: put a (1) in front of the group you'd most like to be doing in 10 years, a (2) before the group next most desired, and a (3) before the group of occupations (job) next desired, and so on.

_____Secretary, office worker, receptionist
_____Teacher, social worker, nurse, doctor
_____Stewardess, model, singer
_____Wife and mother
_____Domestic work
_____Sales lady

135. Now rank the same occupations (jobs) in the same way according to your most realistic guess of what you will actually be doing 10 years from now.

_____Secretary, office worker, receptionist
_____Teacher, social worker, nurse, doctor
_____Stewardess, model, singer
_____Wife and mother
_____Domestic work
_____Sales lady

136. After you get the kind of job you want, will you have to work (check one):

_____With less effort than is necessary in school now
_____With about the same effort that is necessary in school now
_____With more effort than is necessary in school now
_____With a lot more effort than is necessary in school now.

137. Did you do any kind of paying job since September 1972 (check one)?

_____Yes
_____No

138. If you answered "yes" to the last question, what kind of work did you do?

Job 1)_____
Job 2)_____
Job 3)_____
Job 4)_____

139. How long did you do this work?

Job 1)_____
Job 2)_____
Job 3)_____
Job 4)_____

140. Was this work part-time or full-time (check one)?

Job 1)	Part-time_____	Full-time_____
Job 2)	Part-time_____	Full-time_____
Job 3)	Part-time_____	Full-time_____
Job 4)	Part-time_____	Full-time_____

BAUGHMAN and DAHLSTROM INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

CHILD'S NAME _____

INTERVIEWER _____

PLACE OF INTERVIEW _____

DATE _____

Interview with Mother

As you know, we are very interested in children about the age of your daughter, and today I would like to ask you to tell me something about her. I will be asking you what she was like when she was little, what sorts of things you did with her and what sort of child she is now. We know how hard it can be to try to remember sometimes just what happened with some child. Please just do the best you can and I will understand if it is hard to remember. I want you to know that these questions are just for our records, not for the school or anyone else. They will help us to understand children in this age group.

1. Could you tell me, what is _____usually like?

1. Happy ___
2. Quiet ___
3. Sad ___
4. Silly ___
5. other ___

2. Would you describe her as: (check as many as indicated)

1. Neat _____
2. Shy _____
3. Needing to do things just right _____
4. Alert (wide awake) ____
5. Careless _____
6. Usually minds _____
7. Daydreamy (studies things) ___
8. Cautious _____
9. Tries things _____
10. Needs encouragement ____
11. Always in a hurry _____
12. Fearful _____
13. Laughs a lot _____
14. Shows off _____
15. Plays well alone ____

3. Do you have any special concerns about _____?

1. _____

2. _____

4. Now could you tell me about the times when _____ misbehaves? When she does something you don't like. Does this bother you? Does this bother _____'s father?

Indicate degree: ++ = very much; + = yes; 0 = uncertain; - = no; -- = not at all.

Item	True for child	Bother's Mother	Bother's Father
1. Makes a mess around the house			
2. Spilling things while eating			
3. Talking back			
4. Not doing what she is told			
5. Talking too much			
6. Wetting the bed			
7. Stuttering			
8. Lying			
9. Yelling around the house; being noisy			
10. Play with sex organs			
11. Fighting with other children			
12. Not doing chores around the house			
13. Being rude			
14. Destroying things			
15. Getting dirty			
16. Getting into sibling's things			
17. Refusing to go to bed on time			
18. Not eating everything on plate			

5. What sort of things do you have to punish her for?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

6. What sorts of punishment have you used?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

7. Do you often _____ that you are going to have to punish her and then for some reason you do not do it?

1. yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. sometimes _____

8. Some parents expect their children to obey immediately when they tell them to be quiet or pick up something and so on; other's don't think it is terribly important for a child to obey right away. How do you feel about this?

1. Agree _____ 2. Disagree _____ 3. Sometimes _____

9. How does _____'s father feel about strict obedience?

   1. Agrees 2. Disagrees _____ 3. Sometimes _____

10. Some people feel it is very important for a child to learn not to fight with other children; other people feel there are times when a child has to learn to fight. How do you feel about this?

    1. Agree _____ 2. Disagree _____ 3. Sometimes _____

11. When _____ is with other children, is she the one who takes something away from one of the others, or does she have things taken away?

    1. Takes away _____ 2. Has things taken away _____ Neither ___

12. Does it upset you when she fights with other children?

    1. yes _____ 2. no _____ 3. sometimes _____

13. When _____ has done something she knows you don't allow, when your back is turned, does she ever come and tell you about it without your having to ask?

    1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Sometimes _____

14. When you ask about things like that, does she usually admit it?

    1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Sometimes _____

15. Do you keep track of exactly where _____ is and what she is doing most of the time, or can you let her watch out for herself quite a bit?

    1. Watch most of time _____ 2. Let her watch out for self _____

16. How much does _____ decide things for herself now?

    _____

17. What sorts of things can you trust her to do for herself?

    1. _____
    2. _____
    3. _____

18. What do you do when _____ has been especially good?

    _____

19. What would you like to be able to do when _____ has been especially good?

    _____

20. Some parents praise their children quite a bit when they are good; others think that you should take good behavior pretty much for granted and there is no point in praising a child for it. How do you feel about this?

    1. Agree _____ 2. Disagree _____ 3. Not sure _____

21. In bringing _____ up, do you ever say: "Your daddy and mother do it this way?"

    1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Sometimes _____

22. Who else do you hold up as an example - older brother or sister, grandparents, relatives, playmates? _____

23. Is there anyone you mention as an example of what not to do? _____

24. What sorts of things do you enjoy in _____? _____

25. Does _____ show her affection pretty often?

    1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Sometimes _____

26. If "yes" in question above, how? _____

27. Howabout you, do you show your feelings pretty often?

    Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Sometimes _____

28. Does _____'s father show his feelings for her?

    1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Sometimes _____

29. What do you do with _____ when you spend time together?

    1. _____
    2. _____
    3. _____

30. Suppose now _____ has grown up (the age of 35, let's say), what do you imagine she will be doing? _____

31. What sort of work would you like _____ to be doing then? _____

32. What are the chances she will be able to do that? _____

33. How old were you when _____ was born? _____

34. What is your birthplace? _____

35. What work did your own father do? _____

36. What was his education? _____

37. What was your mother's education? _____

38. How far did you go in school? _____

39. How well did you do? _____

40. Did you want to go further? _____

41. Have you worked since leaving school? 1. Yes ____ 2. No _____

42. What sort of work did you do ? _____

43. *Have you been married before? 1. Yes ____ 2. No ____

44. *Did you have children by your first marriage? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___

45. *How old was _____'s father when she was born? _____

46. What was his birthplace? _____

47. How old is he? _____

48. How far did _____'s father go in school? _____

49. What kind of work is he doing now? _____

50. Was there any time when _____ was away from you or her father?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

51. If "yes" to question above, when? 1. Mother _____2. Father ___

52. When this happened, who took care of her? _____

53. How long have you lived in this place? _____

54. How long have you lived in this neighborhood? _____

55. Do you have relatives in Memphis? 1. Yes ____ 2. No ____

56. What does your whole family do together for enjoyment?

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

57. Do you 1) own outright _____ 2) are buying _____
3) rent _____ 4) sublease _____ 5) other _____
the place in which you live now?

58. What is your religion? _____

59. Is your husband's religion the same as your? Yes ____ No _____

60. How many times a month do you attend church? _____

61. Do you go to prayer meeting often? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

62. Do you go to revivals often? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

63. Do you hold any office in the church? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

64. Do you belong to other organizations? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

65. Do you belong to the PTA? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

66. Do you hold office in any of them? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

67. If you do hold office in them, which office? _____

Thank you.

Do you have any questions or comments?

Conduct of Interview

1. Were there any serious interruptions? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

2. If yes, when? _____

3. Was the confidentiality easily preserved? 1. Yes ____ 2. No ____

4. If no, why not? _____

5. Degree of rapport:

   1. Very hospitable _____
   2. Friendly _____
   3. Cool _____
   4. Remote _____
   5. Hostile _____

6. Other informant needed? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

7. If yes, who? _____

Ratings of Mother

A.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Permissiveness					Strictness		
B.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Poor family adjustment					Good family adjustment		
C.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Warm relationship to child					Cold		
D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Responsibly oriented to child caring					Irresponsible		
E.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Values aggressiveness highly					Low on agressiveness		
F.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Father dominates					Mother dominates		
G.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Strong emphasis on child's physical well being					Low emphasis		
H.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Object oriented discipline					Love oriented		

Baughman and Dahlstrom Interview Schedules

NAME OF ENROLLEE_____

SCHOOL, GRADE_____

BIRTH DATE_____

INTERVIEWER_____

PLACE OF INTERVIEW_____

DATE OF INTERVIEW_____

Family Structure

1. Let's begin, _____, by having you tell me the names of each person living in your home, how they are related to you (if they are), about how old they are, and what they do - like work or go to school. Let's begin with your father.

	Name (Only first needed)	Relation	Age	Occupation	Full-Time?	Grade Completed
a.						
b.						
c.						
d.						
e.						
f.						
g.						
h.						

2. Now, please tell me the same things about any brothers or sisters that you have who are living away from homw. Also, tell me where they live.

	Name	Relation	Age	Occupation	Full-Time?	Grade Completed
a.						
b.						
c.						
d.						
e.						

House

3. How many rooms are there in your house? (Number of rooms - include bath) _____

4. Is this a good size for the number of people living in it?

1. Way too small_____
2. A Bit cramped_____
3. About right_____
4. A bit too large_____
5. Way too large_____

5. What condition is your home in?

1. Real run down _____
2. Rather poor_____
3. So-So_____
4. Rather good_____
5. Excellent_____

6. Compared with other houses in your neighborhood, what condition is your house in?

1. Best_____
2. Better_____
3. Average_____
4. Worse_____

7. What changes could be made in your house to make it a better place to live in?

_____

8. Where have you lived most of your life? (City and/or State - approximate length)

_____

Family Finances

9. Compared with other families in your neighborhood, how would you describe your family as far as money is concerned?

1. We're as well off as anyone _____
2. Better off than most _____
3. About average_____
4. Most are better off_____
5. No one is any worse off_____

Parent Behavior

10. When your parents do disagree over what you should or should not do, who usually gets his way?

1. Mother_____
2. Father_____
3. About equal_____

11. Who would you say is the boss in your home?

    1. Mother_____
    2. Father_____
    3. About equal_____

12. How far in school do your parents seem to want you to go?

    1. Mother_____
    2. Father_____

13. What do your parents say or do about your homework?

    1. Mother_____
    2. Father_____

14. What kind of work do your parents want you to do when you finish school?

    1. Mother_____
    2. Father_____

15. Do your parents give you as much freedom as you think you should have?
    1. Mother_____ (yes, no)
    2. Father_____ (yes, no)

16. When you grow up, in what ways would you like to be like your parents?

    1. Mother_____
    2. Father_____

Peers

17. Who are your best friends? List

    _____ _____

    _____ _____

    _____ _____

18. Do you change friends often, or do you pretty much stick with the same ones year after year?

    1. Change often_____
    2. Stick to same_____

19. Are your close friends all girls, or some boys and some girls?

    1. All girls_____
    2. Some boys, some girls_____

20. Do you have a group that you run around with?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

21. If yes (question above), are they all girls, or both girls and boys?

1. All girls_____ 2. Both girls and boys_____

22. How about dating, do you date?

1. Steady_____
2. A lot_____
3. Sometimes_____
4. Never_____

23. Do you have a boy friend?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

24. How do your parents feel about this?_____

25. What seems to make a girl popular around here?

_____

26. Tell me about the things you and your friends do together.

_____

27. In general, how do your friends compare with you in the grades they get?

1. They're better_____ 2. Same_____ 3. Worse_____

28. How do you think you're liked by most children in school?

1. Quite popular_____
2. Well-liked_____
3. Average_____
4. Not too well-liked_____
5. Unpopular_____

29. What do your parents think about your friends?

1. Like them a lot_____
2. Mostly like them_____
3. Mostly dislike them_____
4. Don't like tham at all_____
5. Don't know them_____

30. How do you think you stand in the group you go with?

    1. Usually the leader_____
    2. Sometimes the leader_____
    3. Never the leader_____

31. What things about a boy make you like him?

    _____

32. What things about a girl make you like her?

    _____

33. What things about a boy make you dislike him?

    _____

34. What things about a girl make you dislike her?

    _____

Recreation

35. What do you do for fun on school days?

    1. After school_____with whom_____

    2. After supper_____with whom_____

36. How do you spend your weekends?

    _____with whom_____

37. Which of the following activities do you take part in, and how do your parents feel about it?

Activity	Participate (Yes, No)	Parent Attitude (like, dislike, don't care, don't know)
1. Movies		
2. Smoke		
3. Drive a car (alone, with adults)		
4. Drink		
5. Make out		
6. Play cards		
7. Gamble		
8. Dance		
9. Read books for pleasure		

41. What would you like to see done so that you and your friends could have a better time?

_____

_____

Television

42. How often do you watch television?

1. About every day_____
2. Several days a week_____
3. Only on weekends_____
4. Occasionally_____
5. Practically never_____

43. How many hours do you spend watching TV each day?

1. Weekends_____ 2. School days_____

44. What programs do you watch regularly?_____

45. What is your favorite program?_____

46. Are you allowed to watch any program that you want?

1. Yes_____ No_____

47. If "no", then ask, Who are you restricted by?_____

48. If "no", then ask, what are the restrictions?_____

49. Can you stay up as long as you want to watch TV?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

50. If "no", then ask, how late? 1. School days_____ 2. Weekends_

51. Do you watch Channel 10 (WKNO) outside of school?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

52. How often do you watch it?

1. Regularly_____
2. Occasionally_____
3. Rarely_____
4. Never_____

53. What programs do you watch on Channel 10?_____

54. How satisfied are you with the programs on TV?

1. Great_____
2. Good_____
3. O.K._____
4. Not so good_____
5. Poor_____

Marriage and Family

55. What age do you think is best for girls to get married?_____

56. What age do you think is best for boys to get married?_____

57. Do you think you will marry or stay single?

1. Marry_____
2. Single_____

58. If you think you will stay single, why?

_____

59. If you think you will marry, at what age?_____

60. How many children would you like to have if you do marry?_____

61. Do you have any preference to their (children) sex, and why?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____
Why?_____

62. Would you like for your children to grow up in Memphis?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

63. Why (or why not), question above?_____

64. What kind of person would you like to marry? Tell me what he would be like?

_____

65. How far would you like your husband to go in school, and why?

_____

66. What kind of work would you like your husband to do, and why?

_____

Church

67. Do you go to Sunday School? 1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

68. If yes, how often?_____

69. Do you go to other church services? 1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

70. If yes, how often?_____

71. Do you ever go to revival meetings? 1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

72. If yes, how often?_____

73. What church do you go to?_____

74. What would you say is themain reason that you go to church and/or Sunday School?

_____

75. Do your parents make you go to church? 1. Yes_____ 2. No____

76. Do you go because you want to? 1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

77. Are there some things you like about church services and activities?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

78. If yes (question above), what?_____

79. Are there some things you don't like about church services and activities?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

80. If no, (question above), what?_____

Education

81. Do you and your friends talk about how far you want to go in school? 1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

82. If yes, question above, how often?

1. Frequently_____
2. Occasionally_____
3. Seldom_____

83. What plans do most of your friends seem to have about school?

1. Drop out as soon as possible_____
2. Finish high school_____
3. Go to college_____
4. Go to technical school_____

84. If you didn't have to go to school, would you drop out?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

If "yes", why?_____

85. How far would you like to go in school?_____

Why?_____

86. Do you think that you will make it? 1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

87. If no, why not?_____

88. Has anyone ever talked to you personally about your going to college?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

If "yes", who?_____

89. Does your mother help you with your homework?

1. Very often_____
2. Often_____
3. Sometimes_____
4. Seldom_____
5. Never_____

90. What is your favorite subject?_____

91. What subject do you like least?_____

92. Tell me some things you like about school._____

_____

93. What don't you like about school?_____

94. What changes could be made in the school that would make it better?_____

Work

95. During the school year, do you have chores that you are expected to do around home?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

96. If "yes", what are they?_____

97. About how much time do you spend doing them each day?_____

98. What happens if you don't get them done?_____

99. During the summer, do you work? 1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

100. If "yes", doing what?_____

101. If "yes", about how many hours each day?_____

102. If "no", what do you do during the summer?_____

103. Have you ever earned money by working other than NYC?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

104. Where and when?_____

105. What did you do?_____

106. How did you like the work?_____

107. What sort of work would you like to do when you grow up?

1. First choice_____

2. Second choice_____

108. Where would you like to do this work? 1. Here____ 2. Elsewhere___

3. If elsewhere, where_____

109. How much schooling do you think is necessary for the kind of work you want to do?_____

110. Do you think that you will someday get this kind of work?

1. Yes_____ 2. No_____ 3. If no, why not?_____

111. Do you and your parents talk about what work you might do when you are grown? 1. Yes_____ 2. No_____

112. If yes,how do their ideas agree with yours?_____

Community

113. What wald you say about Memphis as a place to live in?

1. Tops_____
2. Very good_____
3. Not too good_____
4. Poor_____
5. So-so_____

114. Why (to question 113)?_____

115. Do you want to live in the Memphis area when you are grown?

1. Definitely_____
2. Probably_____
3. Uncertain_____
4. Probably not_____
5. Definitely not_____

116. Why (to question 115)?_____

117. Tell me some of the things that you like about Memphis.

_____

118. Tell me some of the things that you don't like about it.

_____

119. What things could be done to make Memphis a better place to live in?_____

elf

120. In summing up, do you feel that your home life is as happy as that of other young people you know?

1. Much more_____
2. Some more_____
3. Average_____
4. Somewhat less_____
5. Much less_____

121. Why (question above)?_____

122. Again, to sum up, are you pretty much satisfied with the sort of person you are?

1. Very_____
2. Kind of_____
3. So-so_____
4. Not too much_____
5. Very dissatisfied_____

123. Why (to question 122)?_____

Interviewer's Notes and Comments

Appendix F

Detail from Parent Interviews

1. The parents of the Enrollee group do not regard their children as being neat, whereas the parents in Groups 2 and 3 do regard their children as being neat.*

2. The mothers of Group 2 feel their children talk too much, twice as often as do the mothers of Group 3.

3. In a general response to things which bother mothers, almost no specificity occurs in the mothers of Groups 2 and 3, with all the mothers responding that they have no answer. However, in the Enrollee group, three or four mothers are consistently specific in their responses. It should be noted that nothing seems to bother father, according to the responses.

4. Among the Enrollee group, half the mothers feel their children should learn to fight sometimes, while this is not true among the mothers of Groups 2 and 3. The mothers of the Enrollee group are much more tolerant of their children fighting with other children, than are the mothers of Groups 2 or 3.

5. Among the mothers of Groups 2 and 3 there is emphasis on trusting the youngster to do errands, while that is a secondary emphasis among the mothers of the Enrollee group. The initial emphasis of the mothers in the Enrollee group is on trust within the household, while this is of secondary emphasis among the other two groups.

6. The mothers of Groups 2 and 3 hold up siblings primarily as an example to their children, while the mothers of the Enrollee group hold up grandparents, relatives, and playmates as well.

7. The mothers of the Enrollee group were quite specific in their answers to the question about what they did when they were together with their children. However, among the mothers of Groups 2 and 3 the only responses were generalized catch-all responses.

8. The mothers of the Enrollee group and Group 3 feel, on a three to one ratio, that their children are likely to do what the mothers would like, while among the mothers of Group 2 the ratio is only fifty-fifty.

9. In terms of the mother's education, the lowest is of mothers of Group 2, then the Enrollee group, while the mothers of Group 3 claim the highest education.

10. The mothers of the Enrollee group claim that they did not do well in school, while the mothers of the other two groups claim they did do well in school.

11. In terms of working since leaving school, all the mothers of the Enrollee group and Group 3 responded that they had done so, but more than one half of the mothers of Group 2 indicated that they did not.

*Group 2 here refers to older control group, Group 3 to younger controls.

12. There are twice as many fathers of Group 3 doing skilled work than either the Enrollee group or Group 2 fathers.

13. The youngsters in Group 2 tend to be away from their parents more than in the Enrollee group or Group 3.

14. In looking at the number of years in the same geographic area, Groups 2 and 3 tend to have more people who have maintained such residence for more than 20 years, than do those of the Enrollee group.

15. In terms of religion, all the respondents of Group 3 are of the same religion as the husband, while this is true with only five of the respondents of the Enrollee group, and three of the respondents of Group 2.

16. As to religious behavior, the mothers in Group 3 attend prayer meetings very frequently, while the mothers of the Enrollee group hardly attend at all. The parents in Groups 2 and 3 go to revivals, while the parents of the Enrollee group do not.

17. The parents of Group 3 were much more hospitable than the parents of the Enrollee group or Group 2.

18. The parents in Group 2 all clustered in the middle of the spectrum in terms of permissiveness, which indicates moderate permissiveness. However, the parents in the Enrollee group and Group 3 spread widely all over the scale.

19. The respondents of Group 3 seemed to be must more responsible in terms of child rearing practices, than either of the other two groups.

20. The respondents in Group 3 value aggressiveness highly, while the respondents of Group 2 are moderate in valuing aggressiveness and the respondents of the Enrollee group place low value on aggressiveness.

21. In family relations, the mother is dominant in the Enrollee group and Group 2, while dominance seems to be divided between mother and father in Group 3.

22. Among the respondents in Groups 2 and 3 discipline seems to be oriented to gaining or keeping love, while among the respondents in the Enrollee group, discipline is more oriented to behavior.

Detail from Individual Interviews

1. The education of the mother in Group 2 terminated at a lower level than the education of the mothers in either the Enrollee group or Group 3. None of the mothers in Group 2 were working, while two or three of the eight mothers in each of the other groups was working.

2. The oldest child of the family of Group 3 is less likely to have finished high school than the oldest child in the family in either of the other groups.

3. The families of Group 3 are living in smaller accommodations than the families of either of the other groups.

4. The members of the Enrollee group believe that other people in the neighborhood are better off financially than they are, to a greater extent than the members of either of the other groups.

5. The members of Group 2 believe that their parents are more likely to be equally sharing in control of the home situation, than do the members of either of the other groups.

6. The Enrollee group indicates that their mothers expect them to continue longer in school, than either of the other two groups. However, no notable difference is indicated in terms of the subject's perception of the father's aspiration in this matter.

7. The subjects in Group 2 indicate that the father has a more active encouraging role in the production of homework, than is characteristic of the responses in either of the other two groups.

8. All subjects express the feeling that mothers give them enough personal freedom. Information on the father in this regard is too diverse to support conclusions.

9. Group 3 claims that they have fewer friends than subjects in either the Enrollee group or Group 2.

10. The members of the Enrollee group date significantly less than the members of the other two groups. Further, the members of the Enrollee group indicate that they have fewer boy friends, than is indicated by the subjects in the other two groups.

11. The Enrollee group and Group 3 feel that appearance and clothing are the prime factor in popularity, whereas a wider set of criteria seems to be evident in Group 2.

12. The Enrollee group and Group 2 indicate more individual interpersonal activities as the primary behavior which they undertake with others, while Group 3 tends to identify more group activities as the primary thing they do with friends. We advance the notion that Group 3 indicates activities requiring less personal investment in interpersonal relationships, than is indicated in either of the other two groups.

13. The Enrollee group and Group 2 feel they are perceived more positively by their peers, than is evidenced by Group 3.

14. Group 3 feels that their parents do not really know their friends, and if they do know them, they do not like them, while the Enrollee group and Group 2 feel that their parents know more of their friends and like them better.

15. Group 2 expresses a likeable characteristic among girls as being ladylike, more significantly than do members of the Enrollee group or Group 3.

16. Group 2 identifies meanness and intolerance as the prime characteristics that they dislike about boys, while these prime characteristics are identified by neither the Enrollee group or Group 3.

17. The Enrollee group is able to make clear differentiations of characteristics that they do not like in boys, while Groups 2 and 3 have more difficulty in doing so. This is exemplified by the ability of the Enrollee group to identify specific secondary characteristics of dislike, while there is a lower ability to make such definitions by the other two groups.

18. Group 3 seems to express a general underlying concern for meanness and intolerance characteristics in the behavior of others, than do either of the other two groups.

19. Group 3 is more likely to spend free time recreationally with their families, than either of the other two groups.

20. Watching TV seems to be the dominant activity after dinner of all the subject groups.

21. The members of Group 2 play cards less frequently than do the members of the other two groups.

22. There is some marginal indication that the Enrolles see their parents as liking them to read, more than do the members of the other two groups.

23. The Enrollee group seems less satisfied with quality of TV programs than do either of the other two groups. This has been identified by marginal reflections in terms of frequency of watching the Educational TV channel, versus watching the programming of other channels.

24. The members of Group 3 believe a girl should be older when she marries, than do the members of either of the other two groups.

25. The members of Group 3 also feel that boys should be older when married, as compared with the other two groups.

26. While the members of Groups 2 and 3 all feel that they will marry, three of the eight Enrollees interviewed feel that they will stay single.

27. The members of Group 3 feel that they will marry later than will the members of the other two groups. This appears to relate to the responses that Group 3 gave in terms of being negative to early marriage.

28. While the members of Groups 2 and 3 feel strongly that the key characteristic in the potential marriage partner should be dependability, the members of the Enrollee group responded in a more diverse manner, with no emphasis on dependability.

29. The Enrollee group was more interested in their potential husbands finishing college, than either of the other two groups.

30. There is a clear indication that the aspirations of the Enrollee group were for their potential husbands to be professionals, a much more frequent expression than in either of the other two groups.

31. The Enrollee group and Group 3 are much more regular attenders of Sunday School than Group 2, with better than one half attending on a regular Sunday basis in the Enrollee group and Group 3, and only one fourth of Group 2 doing likewise. However, the members of Group 2 attend church services more regularly than either of the other two groups. It appears that these patterns are clearly related. Group 2, which is the older group, attends church revivals with greater frequency than either of the other two groups.

32. As to reasons for church attendance, Group 2 focused their purposes on worshipping and learning about God, while the Enrollee group and Group 3 have some responses as to pleasing their parents, and some claim they are personally religious. The Enrollee group feel that their parents exercise more control on making them go to church, than either of the other groups. As many as seven of the eight respondents in the Enrollee group felt that their parents made them go to church, while only three of the respondents of the other groups felt that way.

33. The Enrollees and Group 3 plan to go as far as completing High School in their educations, in much greater number than do the subjects in Group 2, which scatters between dropping out and completing college.

34. There is a much heavier incidence of discussing educational plans with guidance counselors in Group 3 than in the other two groups. At the same time there is a much heavier incidence of discussing these plans with parents in Group 2 than in the other two groups.

35. As to school subjects, the Enrollees indicated that they dislike math more than any other subject, more significantly than did either of the other two groups.

36. Almost one half of the Enrollees and the Group 2 subjects indicated that they liked principals and teachers, while none of Group 3 so noted.

37. As might be expected, the subjects in Group 2 worked substantially more frequently in the summer than the subjects in the Enrollee group or Group 3.

38. In dealing with the question of what they do in the summer if they do not work, the respondents in Groups 2 and 3 generally had no answer; in the Enrollee group, while their answers are scattered, each had something specific to identify. The Enrollee group is more likely to work somewhere else in addition to the NYC experience, than the members of Group 3 are likely to have worked anywhere at all.

39. There is a large number in the Enrollee group who feel they do not wish to live in Memphis because people are cold and not together, while this is not reflected in the responses of Groups 2 and 3. Groups 2 and 3 scatter widely across the responses. Those in Group 2 who want to leave Memphis indicate that they are tired of it. Those who wish to remain in Memphis among the Enrollee group and Group 3, are interested in staying here because their families are here.

40. The Enrollee group indicates that Memphis needs civic improvement, while this is not a prevalent or major response of either of the other groups.

41. The Enrollee group wants to clean up Memphis to make it a better place, while the members of the other two groups want to get people together in order to make Memphis a better place.

42. While we have responses in all three groups saying that they have a happy home life because of a close family, there is a much more heavy incidence of this response in Groups 2 and 3 than in the Enrollee group. Twice the number of respondents in Groups 2 and 3 gave this indication than in the Enrollee group, the responses of which are scattered.

Appendix G

Table of Birthdates

Enrollees	14/15 year-old Controls	16/18 year-old Controls
1957	1957	1952
January 8	January 3	August 12
January 9	January 8	November 4
March 28	January 23	
May 6	February 16	1953
May 28	February 19	
June 1	March 3	June 27
June 19	March 9	
July 20	March 17	1954
July 21	April 29	
July 25	May 2	August 14
August 3	May 12	August 18
August 29	June 11	September 11
August 31	June 16	
September 3	June 24	1955
September 4	July 2	
November 6	July 2	January 20
November 19	July 5	January 29
December 5	July 14	February 10
December 23	July 22	February 16
	July 26	March 14
1958	August 2	April 8
	September 13	April 12
January 9	November 13	June 10
January 23	December 8	June 12
January 28	December 18	June 16
March 4		June 20
March 7	1958	August 8
March 30	January 21	August 23
March 30	January 26	September 25
April 19	January 30	September 29
April 28	February 8	September 29
May 1	February 22	November 10
May 23	March 4	November 13
May 27	March 4	December 4
June 8	March 4	
June 12	March 14	1956
June 16	March 15	
June 19	March 16	January 24
June 22	April 1	February 11
July 11	April 4	February 18
August 11	April 26	February 21
August 11	May 12	February 26
August 14	May 16	February 28
August 25	May 18	March 6
September 2	June 26	March 30
September 12	July 4	April 26
September 20	July 26	May 20

Enrollees	14/15 year-old Controls	16/18 year-old Controls
September 22	July 29	June 5
September 23	July 30	June 19
October 2	August 11	June 22
October 22	September 23	July 5
	October 15	July 21
1959	October 28	July 22
		August 21
June 2		August 28
unknown		August 30
		unknown

APPENDIX H

The material in Appendix H has been supplied by the office of the Memphis-Shelby County Neighborhood Youth Corps In-school program.

Table 1

Analysis of Dropouts by Cause
prior to beginning of summer program

	14/15 year-old enrollees	16/18 year-old controls
Voluntary withdrawals	3	7
Involuntary withdrawals, financial ineligibility	4	0
Involuntary withdrawals, discharge for cause	2	6
Neither voluntary nor involuntary withdrawals	2	1
Totals	11	14

Selection procedures utilized by Neighborhod Youth Corps for 14/15 year-old black teenage project were as follows:

After notification by Social Service Delivery Systems as to where the seven day care centers to be used as worksites were located, the Neighborhood Youth Corps office selected the seven nearest Junior High schools in which eligible enrollees would be located. At these Junior High schools, the school counselors, in conjunction with Neighborhood Youth Corps field coordinators, disseminated information throughout the individual schools by means of public address announcements, bulletin board announcements, and home room announcements. They stressed that any girl who fit the eligibility criteria, interested in participating, should contact the guidance counselor. After several days and interviews by the guidance counselors, those still interested were provided applications for participation in the project. Three times the required amount were sent to the NYC office for consideration.

Once approved, all applications were located in the files alphabetically by IBM school location codes for selection for participation in the project. Selection at this point for the participants and control group was done by "pulling" every third folder in sequence until the desired number of participants was made for both groups. It can be seen that several rotations of all folders was necessary to achieve the total amount required.

Thus, some selection and subjectivity could possibly have occurred in the total number enrolled at the school locations. This is meant to mean that some subjectivity may have entered the picture as to a counselor thinking that one child desired to participate more than the next child. However, the final selection was random by 1 - 2 - 3 so that no selection factor other than "happening" to be the third folder entered the picture.

VOLUNTARY WITHDRAWALS
14/15 year-olds (before summer 1973)

Termination date	Name	Reason
12/4/72	W.E.	Found another job
5/11/73	G.D.	Not interested in working did not reapply for summer 1973
5/11/73	W.V.	Not interested in working did not reapply for summer 1973
16/18 year-olds		
1/30/73	G.V.	Moved from area
4/9/73	B.M.	Moved from area
5/11/73	H.V.	Not interested in working did not reapply for summer 1973
5/11/73	D.V.A.	Not interested in working did not reapply for summer 1973
5/11/73	H.R.M.	Not interested in working did not reapply for summer 1973
5/11/73	J.C.F.	Not interested in working did not reapply for summer 1973
5/11/73	T.Y.	Not interested in working did not reapply for summer 1973

INVOLUNTARY WITHDRAWALS - financial ineligibility

14/15 year-olds

4/6/73	C.C.	Provided false financial information on application. When validated, income proved to be in excess of $10,000.
4/12/73	S.E.	Provided false financial information on application. When validated, income proved to be in excess of $11,000
5/11/73	A.A.	Application for summer indicated family financial situation changed - over limit as set by U.S.Government for number in house
5/11/73	B.E.	Application for summer indicated family financial situation changed - over limit as set by U.S. for number in house

INVOLUNTARY WITHDRAWALS - discharge for cause

14/15 year-olds

2/23/73	A.L.R.	Discharged at the request of work site for failure to perform duties after repeated conferences in accordance with U.S. Dept. of Labor standards

16/18 year-olds

2/12/73	H.K.	Excessive absences after repeated counseling for attitudinal change as outlined in the NYC In-school handbook governing terminations
3/2/73	D.F.	Pregnant
3/20/73	T.D.	Excessive absences after repeated counseling for attitudinal change as outlined in the NYC In-school handbook governing terminations
3/29/73	F.E.	Failure to follow instructions to take physical as directed by the U.S.Dept. of Labor
3/20/73	T.M.F.	Maladjustment after three attempts to modify and adjust enrollee attitude toward project and its objectives
4/19/73	W.D.A.	Excessive absences after repeated counseling for attitudinal change as outlined in the NYC In-school handbook governing terminations

NEITHER VOLUNTARY NOR INVOLUNTARY

14/15 year-olds

5/11/73	D.V.	Failed to provide information on application to determine eligibility in accordance with U.S. Dept. of Labor standards
12/4/72	G.D.	Extended period of illness

16/18 year-olds

1/30/73	H.H.	School schedule conflict resulting in school subjects being considered more important than day care project